

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

**She sat with her legs open, he danced with a man:
Attitudes to non-normative gendered behaviours in a
university student population**

by

Myra Miller MLLMYR001
Supervisor: Ms S Maw

A minor dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the
Degree of Masters in Clinical Psychology

Department of Psychology
University of Cape Town
2004

Declaration:

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signature__

Signed by candidate

Date 23/04/04

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Sia, my supervisor, my heartfelt thanks for giving so much of yourself and your time. You offered your energy and enthusiasm, your time, expertise and so much more. How you held me through this process will never be forgotten.

My sincerest thanks to Mark Tomlinson, not only for your expertise, but for your kindness and care.

A special thank you to Jane Bennett for your invaluable recommendations and input. To Colin Tredoux, thank you very much for your willingness and assistance.

I am extremely grateful to the first year psychology students for giving of their time and providing me with the research data.

To Darryl, Chanty and Bev, I know that the grammatical and linguistic challenges I posed were no easy feat. Your help and support is appreciated more than you know. A great debt of thanks goes to you Tsedi for your help, your support, your calm presence and so much more.

For you Fiona Brown, as far away as you are you were always around.

And to Kitsel – I so wish you could have been here now to share this.

Trying to thank you, Ari, doesn't feel possible. Not only did you have unwavering faith, but you loved and cared for me throughout – thank you so so much.

ABSTRACT

This study is an exploration of the attitudes of first year psychology students (n=382) at the University of Cape Town to gender norm violations. Two variations of a questionnaire were administered to assess the degree of acceptance or unacceptance of behaviours that deviate from the expected norms for men and women. The questionnaires were similar in that scenarios used were the same. However, in the second variation of the questionnaire, the gender was reversed. This was done to control for factors beyond gender stereotyping which may confound the results. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was carried out on the data. Broadly speaking, the findings indicated that both men and women agreed on a large number of gender acceptable and unacceptable behaviours for both sexes but differed in their assessment of the degree of unacceptability. Levels of tolerance varied, with women being generally more tolerant than men. Men appeared to be more critical of one another, but their behaviours were also more censored by women. Attributions also varied with women's violations of gender boundaries being seen as sexually suggestive, whereas the violations committed by men led to them being seen as potentially homosexual. Closer analysis revealed that subtle underlying gender biases were present, with a range of behaviours being only slightly more or less acceptable for one gender than the other. Based on these findings it is argued that both men and women are subject to the same gender stereotyping and are thus in agreement as to which behaviours are deemed unacceptable and thus police their own and the opposite sex accordingly. The subtle differences could be accounted for by the internalisation of longstanding gender norms that are deeply entrenched even within a population living in an era of gender equality and non-discrimination.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Title page | |
| Acknowledgements | |
| Abstract | |
| | <u>Page</u> |
| CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Chapter outline | 2 |
| CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW | 4 |
| 2.1 Chapter outline | 4 |
| 2.2 Terminology | 4 |
| 2.3 Elucidating sex and gender | 6 |
| 2.4 Historical overview | 8 |
| 2.5 Current theories of gender | 10 |
| 2.5.1 Postmodernism and gender as a social construct | 11 |
| 2.5.2 Gender essentialism | 14 |
| 2.5.3 Context and its impact on becoming gendered | 15 |
| 2.6 Gender differences | 17 |
| 2.6.1 A theory of socialisation | 18 |
| 2.6.2 Social science and accentuating difference | 22 |
| 2.6.3 Gender and power | 24 |
| 2.7 Gender normative behaviours and conformity | 28 |
| 2.7.1 Theories of conformity | 28 |
| 2.7.1.1 Cognitive schemas | 28 |
| 2.7.1.2 Normative and informational influence | 30 |
| 2.7.1.3 Normative prescriptions | 31 |
| 2.7.2 Summary: Theories of conformity | 32 |
| 2.8 Gender practice and policing | 33 |
| 2.8.1 Consequences of crossing gender boundaries | 33 |
| 2.8.2 Men and gender boundary violations | 35 |
| 2.8.3 Women and gender boundary violations | 37 |
| 2.8.4 Heterosexuality and homosexuality | 41 |
| 2.9 McCarl-Nielsen et al. and “inappropriate gendered behaviour” | 43 |
| 2.10 Conclusion | 46 |

| | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| CHAPTER 3 | METHOD..... | 47 |
| 3.1 | Methodology..... | 47 |
| 3.1.1. | Survey methodology..... | 47 |
| 3.1.2. | Measuring attitudes | 47 |
| 3.1.3. | Questionnaires..... | 48 |
| 3.1.4. | Likert scales..... | 49 |
| 3.1.5. | Limitations of methodology..... | 49 |
| 3.2 | Research Instrument..... | 50 |
| 3.2.1. | McCarl-Nielsen, Walden & Kunkel study (2000)..... | 50 |
| 3.2.2. | Adaptation of the research instrument..... | 52 |
| 3.2.3. | Behavioural norms questionnaires..... | 55 |
| 3.3 | Subjects..... | 57 |
| 3.4 | Reliability and validity..... | 58 |
| 3.5 | Methods of Analysis..... | 59 |
| 3.5.1 | Factor analysis..... | 60 |
| 3.5.2 | Analysis of variance (ANOVA)..... | 60 |
| 3.6 | Ethical considerations..... | 61 |
| CHAPTER 4 | RESULTS..... | 62 |
| 4.1 | Chapter outline..... | 62 |
| 4.2 | Part one..... | 62 |
| 4.2.1. | Descriptive data..... | 62 |
| 4.3 | Part two..... | 64 |
| 4.4 | Part three..... | 68 |
| 4.4.1. | Category 1 | 68 |
| 4.4.2. | Category 2 | 72 |
| 4.4.3. | Category 3..... | 74 |
| 4.4.4. | Category 4..... | 79 |
| 4.4.5. | Category 5..... | 83 |
| 4.4.6. | Category 6..... | 85 |
| 4.5 | Part four..... | 86 |
| 4.6 | Conclusion..... | 91 |
| CHAPTER 5 | DISCUSSION..... | 92 |
| 5.1 | Introduction..... | 92 |

| | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 5.2 | The sample..... | 92 |
| 5.3 | Category 1: Male-female disagreement on either atypical or control behaviours..... | 95 |
| | 5.3.1 Sexual insinuation..... | 95 |
| | 5.3.2 Appreciation of appearance..... | 99 |
| | 5.3.3 Interpretations of body language..... | 100 |
| | 5.3.4 Knitting in public..... | 101 |
| 5.4 | Category 2: Male-female disagreement on both atypical and control behaviours..... | 101 |
| | 5.4.1 Physical aggression..... | 102 |
| | 5.4.2 Purchase of condoms – men versus women..... | 103 |
| 5.5 | Category 3: Behavioural monitoring by both males and females: in-group and between-group... | 104 |
| | 5.5.1 Gendered behaviours as a threat to masculinity: homosexuality and emasculatation..... | 105 |
| 5.6 | Category 4: Degree of acceptability or unacceptability of behaviours is gender dependent..... | 108 |
| | 5.6.1 Buying flowers..... | 108 |
| | 5.6.2 Unacceptability of Tupperware parties for men..... | 110 |
| | 5.6.3 Make-up implies homosexuality in men, narcissism in women..... | 111 |
| | 5.6.4 Sexual harassment..... | 112 |
| 5.7 | Category 5: Male and female agreement on gender appropriate behaviours..... | 114 |
| | 5.7.1 Internet dating..... | 115 |
| | 5.7.2 Acceptability of buying drinks..... | 115 |
| 5.8 | Category 6: A thematic comparison of female and male rating of the five most inappropriate behaviours | 117 |
| 5.9 | Tolerance and transgression of gender boundaries..... | 119 |
| 5.10 | Limitation of the study..... | 120 |
| 5.11 | Recommendations..... | 122 |
| REFERENCES..... | | 123 - 130 |
| APPENDIX 1..... | | 131 |
| APPENDIX 2..... | | 133 |
| APPENDIX 3..... | | 136 |

TABLE OF TABLES

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 1: | Items selected from norm violation categories..... | 56 |
| Table 2: | Gender..... | 62 |
| Table 2: | Age..... | 63 |
| Table 4: | Race..... | 63 |
| Table 5: | Eigenvalues..... | 64 |
| Table 6: | Factor loadings: extraction – maximum likelihood..... | 65 |
| Table 7: | Items in which female and male participants responded differently to the atypical and control vignettes..... | 69 |
| Table 8: | Items in which female and male participants responded differently to the appropriateness or inappropriateness of atypical and control behaviours..... | 73 |
| Table 9: | Items in which male and female participants rated the behaviour differently depending on the gender of the actor | 75 |
| Table 10: | Items in which there was a significant difference between the genders and a significant difference in responses to the behaviours | 80 |
| Table 11: | Items in which female and male participants did not differ in their ratings..... | 84 |
| Table 12: | Items which female participants rated as most inappropriate..... | 85 |
| Table 13: | Items which male participants rated as most inappropriate..... | 86 |
| Table 14: | Behaviours which women and men rated as unacceptable for members of their own gender, but acceptable for member of the opposite gender..... | 87 |
| Table 15: | Behaviours that women rated as less acceptable for women and men rated as less acceptable for men..... | 88 |
| Table 16: | Behaviours that women and men only found acceptable for members of their own genders..... | 89 |
| Table 17: | Behaviours that women and men found more acceptable when performed by members of the opposite gender..... | 90 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Being male or female is a basic attribute designated at birth according to the appearance of the external genitalia; those with penises are boys and those with vaginas, girls. This fundamental biological distinction, made as the infant takes its first breath, determines the position of this individual in the world. It predetermines not only opportunities, but also how he or she will be responded to, what he or she will be allowed to do, say, think and feel. Thus, a gender specific identity creates a gender specific existence and it is through this lens of 'genderedness' through which all experiences is perceived. This genderedness is largely unconscious and intrinsic to basic identity, so much so, that it feels natural and fixed. Thus both sexes conform to these gender appropriate expectations, often without conscious awareness.

Each sex has specific temperamental and behavioural attributions that are widely accepted and indeed, expected. Specific attributions may vary somewhat over time and with culture, race and class, however the idea of the active and dominant masculine and the passive and submissive feminine are practically universal norms. Whilst there will always be those that violate these norms and defy the stereotypes, a 'social policing' system has been implemented where both genders police not only members of their own gender, but also members of the opposite gender in order to discourage gender inappropriate behaviours. Numerous strategies ranging from disapproval and exclusion, to force and violence inspire conformity. However, gender identity is more than just a

social construct, it is upheld by the law, which demands registration as either male or female.

Historical and social constructions of gender have resulted in a power imbalance, with men holding the control and women, being secondary. Thus in order to redress this power imbalance, the legal status of women has become enshrined and protected in the South African Constitution which ensures, at least in theory, equality of the sexes.

Given the legal imperative of equality between the sexes, the question raised is whether there has been a change in attitudes allowing for the practice of gender equality. To test whether there has been an attitudinal shift, a questionnaire was administered to a group of first year students in the Humanities Faculty at the University of Cape Town.

1.1 CHAPTER OUTLINE

CHAPTER 2 reviews the literature as it pertains to gender, gender roles and differences as well as the policing of gender norms. The difference between sex and gender is defined and the historical roots of gendered behaviour, explored. The theoretical underpinnings are considered from various perspectives including postmodernism and feminism. Particular attention is paid to the social context and the role of socialisation in the formation and reinforcement of gender norms. The effects of gender identity on power distribution are discussed. Theories of conformity are postulated including cognitive

schemas as well as normative influence and prescription. Finally the effects of gender norm violations pertaining to both sexes are discussed.

CHAPTER 3 describes the methodology used; survey methodology. An outline is provided of the questionnaires that were designed to measure attitudes to non-normative gendered behaviours, as well as a discussion of the research study on which these questionnaires were based. A demographic account of the subjects who participated in this study is provided. The methods of analysis, Factor Analysis and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) are explained and consideration given to ethical issues.

CHAPTER 4 analyses the results of the survey. Descriptive data, including a breakdown of gender, age and race is presented. The initial analysis of the data that was carried out using Factor Analysis is discussed as well as the reasons for discarding this method of analysis. The subsequent analysis using ANOVA is divided and categorised according to the findings and is discussed in terms of female and male agreement and/or disagreement to the various behaviours outlined in the questionnaires.

CHAPTER 5 provides a discussion of the results paying attention to the context of the research and linking the findings with previous research as described in the literature review.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 CHAPTER OUTLINE

This chapter examines gender and gender differences. As gender is commonly used synonymously with sex, the distinction between the two concepts is discussed and the terminology explained. Thereafter gender is explored and traced from evolutionary roots through to biological and sociological explanations, and finally to present day theories where explanations are still being sought through physical and social science.

Consideration of various theories of gender, particularly postmodernism and feminism (including gender essentialism) highlight how gender is variably constructed and understood. Irrespective of this understanding, gender impacts on our daily lives and sets normative standards of behaviour. These behaviours and the issue of conformity and non-conformity are understood by discussing both the social mechanisms involved, as well as the role of internalisation of gender norms.

2.2 TERMINOLOGY

There is no universal definition of sex or of gender and it is therefore acceptable practice for writers and theorists to provide their own definitions and terms (Burn, 1996). Thus, a brief distinction between the concept of sex and that of gender will be made. Use of the

terminology is based on that used by Kay Deaux (1985) in her article titled “Sex and Gender”. Sex refers to the biological or anatomical distinction between male and female. Gender is more than biological sex; it includes the psychological characteristics and qualities that accompany the biological state. The word ‘sex’ is used in research, where participants are divided according to biological differences. This clearly points to sex, rather than gender. In instances where assessments or opinions are made that are socially based, or based on characteristics that are not biological in nature, the term ‘gender’ will apply (Deaux, 1985).

Understanding social stereotypes elucidates what is meant by gender stereotypes. Individuals in any given society are classified into different social categories (Burn, 1996). In order to draw comparisons between members of other categories, each group establishes norms or normative standards as a benchmark for comparison. This evaluation of others generates beliefs about members of alternative groups. The result is social stereotyping (Kunda, 1999). “[P]eople come to believe or behave as if the stereotypes about themselves are true” through a process whereby individuals sanction group norms or stereotypes as their own (Von Hippel, Hawkins & Schooler, 2001, p. 193). This is termed ‘self-stereotyping’. Individuals internalise group stereotypes and behave accordingly thus creating self-concepts that are consistent with stereotypes (Von Hippel, Hawkins & Schooler, 2001). In addition, rules emerge concerning the relationships between members of differing categories. These norms are broad and are not specific to each and every individual action, but rather allow for a range of normative or acceptable

behaviours (Sherif, 1982). Gender stereotyping can be conceptualised as a type of social stereotyping and as such operates on similar principles.

2.3 ELUCIDATING SEX AND GENDER

Sex is a central tenet to any society, which it divides clearly into two categories, namely male and female. It is a principal organising component of our lives. Together with race and class, gender is considered to be one of the three central mechanisms responsible for the distribution of power and resources, and one of the “three central themes out of which we fashion the meanings of our lives” (Kimmel & Messner, 1992, p. 2). In theory, gender intersects other social divisions; however, in practice, it supersedes them creating binary divisions (Lorber, 2000). Even the law upholds this division with every individual being legally male or female (Budlender, 1998). From a social perspective, both sex categories have a distinctive behavioural code that dictates appropriate behaviours including habits, dress, occupations and expression of feeling, to name but a few. These codes of conduct are often implicitly understood and conformed to ‘voluntarily’ (West & Zimmerman, 1991). Labelling of the appropriateness or inappropriateness of such gendered behaviour is universal, and the distinction between that which is appropriate for men and for women is usually clear. Questions related to the mechanisms of gender labelling have frequently been raised, as well as speculation about whom such labelling best serves and whether such labels are different in varying contexts or specific situations (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1996). That these questions are posed at all validates the significant gendered

nature of our lives. As such, a person's sex shapes the very core of his or her identity even in the absence of conscious awareness of the implications of such gendering.

Irrespective of gender distinctions and constructions, gender equity and equality is a constitutional imperative in South Africa. The new constitution, drawn up in 1994, effective as of 1997, cites non-discrimination as a principle guideline. The constitution aims to dismantle the legacy of social segregation including racial, religious, class and gender segregation, promote [gender] equality and protect women's rights (Budlender, 1998). However, the lived reality of women in South Africa portrays a different reality to that stipulated constitutionally. Discrimination against women is still practiced both in the home and in the workplace (Jewkes & Abrahams, 2002). Although social changes, including gender equality, are being implemented externally, shifts in attitudes and behaviours are slow (Augoustinos & Walker, 1995). Adapting to social norms is a process (Crandall, Eshelman & O'Brien, 2002). Initially there is a reluctance to change attitudes, which may lead individuals to suppress feelings, and thoughts that are considered to be inappropriate. This suppression is externally motivated and termed 'compliance' (Bermant, Kelman & Warwick, 1978). In a South African context, with our legacy of discrimination and prejudice, the pressure to suppress discriminatory attitudes is high. As society's intolerance for discrimination grows and an awareness of what is correct permeates, individuals are more inclined to suppress incongruent and inappropriate attitudes (Dowden & Robinson, 1993). Thus, an apparent decrease in discrimination may be a function of conformity to social norms and new legislation, rather than a reflection of true shifts in attitudes and beliefs (Crandall et al., 2002).

Gender equality threatens longstanding masculine superior status and [South African] men would understandably be hesitant to relinquish their positions of power and privilege. In theory and principle things may change, but in essence the underlying dynamics remain the same. In practice, when one type of gender inequality is obliterated, another surfaces in its place (Lorber, 2000).

2.4 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The issues of gender and those surrounding it are age old. Belief in the essential difference between men and women translates into designated roles for each gender and this is evidenced throughout history. Evolutionary theories, citing role divisions based on reproductive capacity, date back to hunter-gatherer tales and are the cornerstone of present day male and female stereotypes. These theorists claim that the differences between men and women are innate and as “much a product of natural selection as [are] our bipedal locomotion and opposable thumbs” (Browne, 1998, p.5).

At the turn of the nineteenth century, against a background of widely accepted truths about gender, (such as the temporary disability women suffered monthly with the onset of menstruation), inherent differences between men and women were proved scientifically (Bohan, 2002 & Rosenberg, 1976). Essentially this underpinned mainstream beliefs in the ‘real’ dichotomy between men and women. Although the accepted understanding was that of biological difference, it had, over time been incorporated into a cultural framework and taken on social implications in daily practice and experience (Bohan, 2002). Research at

this time pronounced women to be 'naturally' passive, nurturing, well suited to domestic work and the rearing of children, and unsuited to life and work beyond the home; all of this a result of their biological composition (Geddes, & Thompson, 1889). Additional research findings concluded that men had larger brains than women, which explained their supposed intellectual superiority. Other research findings claimed that the section of the brain responsible for reasoning capacity was also larger in men than in women (Ellis, 1934)). It was also found that education could damage a woman's reproductive system (Hall, 1905). This scientific research, much like research of any other era, mirrored contemporary beliefs about sex differences that were socially accepted and practiced.

Towards the middle of the twentieth century, sociological theorists, such as Talcott Parsons and Karl Marx, also influenced contemporary theories and understandings of gender. Parsons (1952) attributed the division of labour between men and women to the increasing need for labour specialisation as society evolved, with a more evolved society requiring greater labour role specialisation. This, he claimed, resulted in a broader split between public and private labour roles. Given that women were, by biological design, mothers and caregivers, rendering them housebound, they were by nature unable to work in the public sector. Men, on the other hand, had more geographical freedom and could thus travel and engage in work out of the home. Marx also explained the division of labour as a 'natural' division (Marx & Engels, 1969). Factors such as oppression or inequality, or the disparity in physical strength between the sexes, at a time where physical strength was needed, (for example, in ploughing), were not considered. In addition there was no apparent awareness of what was 'natural' as opposed to what had

been socially constructed, and thus no attention was paid to the relationship between the two (Van Every, 1996).

Currently, the notion that education can harm a woman's ability to reproduce is considered preposterous, but studies attempting to determine both meaningful and obscure differences between men and women continue. The belief in such 'natural' differences between men and women serves to justify differential treatment of each sex. Women have always faced social devaluation with men being constructed as 'more than' women; more versatile, more capable, more valued (Lorber, 2000). Deaux (1985) asserts that in the field of sex and gender, research into sex differences is not only the most enduring, but also qualifies as the most frequently and extensively investigated theme.

Historically, the pattern of contemporary social understandings and practices regarding gender roles has had substantial influence over gender theories across the disciplines. Shields claimed "science... played handmaiden to social values" (1975, p.753). Other than reinforcing the stereotype of women in a position of servitude, this raises the question of who or what plays 'handmaiden' today. A number of theories will thus be considered in this regard.

2.5 CURRENT THEORIES OF GENDER

Scores of theories of gender have been put forward. Three broad theoretical areas, namely

postmodernism, gender essentialism and the role of context in becoming gendered will be looked at in an attempt to understand contemporary concepts of gender.

2.5.1 Postmodernism and gender as a social construct

Current understandings of gender as a reflection of social norms, not as characteristics dictated by sex, may be usefully explored within a postmodern framework (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1988). Postmodernism challenges our understandings of knowledge and truth. From this perspective, it is not possible to describe reality in simple, uncomplicated terms, as the very language that is used creates the reality it describes. Social constructionism, a form of postmodernism, proposes that our reality is rooted in social exchange (Gergen, 1999 & 2001). The knowledge we have is that which we have constructed or hypothesized and then given meaning to, based on the context within which this knowledge was created.

A distinction is made between constructionism that is termed social or weak, and constructionism that is considered strong (Kitzinger, 1991). According to Gergen (1999), weak constructionism is the notion that it is not the actual event, but the meaning given to the event that is constructed. Thus the same event is seen and understood differently depending on the perspective from which it is viewed. This can be illustrated by using an example of cross cultural understandings of “natural phenomena”. Members of one culture may be confident that they have seen a comet, whereas members of an alternative

culture may interpret the same sight as a “supernatural visitation” (Bohan, 2002, p.75).

Strong constructionism refers to the construction of both the event and the attributed meaning. The language used to describe the event, creates the event itself as well as its meaning (Bohan, 2002).

An African example to demonstrate strong constructionism would be that of royalty. In countries such as Swaziland and Lesotho, as is the norm in a large majority of countries where there is royal lineage, the king is the ruler and the queen, essentially his aide. Often these kings may take multiple wives. As such, the event is constructed as: the person in charge is a man who has a woman or a number of women who are required to assist, accompany and/or help him in his public or private capacity. The meaning ascribed to this ‘event’ or practice is that men are leaders, and women are subordinates whose function it is to ‘help’ the leader whatever ways he deems useful. In contrast, in South Africa, in the Limpopo Province, the Rain Queen (not the king) of the Balobedu people, is the sovereign monarch. In this culture the queen does not marry. This in itself is an unusual practice as unmarried women in most cultures are less valued than their married counterparts. Not only does the Rain queen remain unmarried, but also she is not expected to restrict her sexual practices. Again, such practices would be unacceptable, or at least unusual, in most other cultures, as women are supposed to be monogamous relationships, preferably within the confines of marriage, in order to gain respectability. However, the Rain Queen is a highly respected figure who is able to engage in sexual relations with whomever she pleases and when she wants to reproduce, a male with the correct royal credentials is selected to oblige (SA News, Posted Fri, 11 Apr 2003). As

such, this particular 'event' or practice is constructed quite differently to the previously mentioned example. In this Limpopo Province the leader is a woman who has men to assist her and satisfy her needs. Therefore in this culture, the meaning of woman's status and function is presumably constructed quite differently to that in a male dominated monarchy. Such meaning is made through the language used to describe and understand these constructions.

In everyday language and discourse, words and terminology are loaded with meaning. The words we use to describe our thoughts, our activities and ourselves shape our identities. We are essentially "imprisoned" by the 'gendered language' we speak (Threadgold & Cranny-Francis, 1990). The word 'masculine' is used synonymously with strength, assertiveness and power. Spoken power is thus masculine which in turn translates into the masculinization of practiced power (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1996). Success too, is a male attribute as one gains 'mastery' (Walkerdine, 1998). 'Nurse' and 'nursery school teacher' are words referring to women unless otherwise specified (with 'male' as a prefix). These are caring and nurturing professions and it follows that those involved would be women. Thus, our gender is constructed verbally and entrenched with every verbal repetition.

In different cultures the understandings of accepted and practiced norms affect the language used to describe such norms as well as the actual behaviours and individual experiences of the members in these cultures (Bohan, 2002). In contemporary Western culture we understand gender as binary categories that have been created as a result of the

differentiation of human beings into two biologically different sexes. Gender is either man or woman, male or female, masculine or feminine. Social constructionism highlights the different understandings and experiences of similar concepts or events for members of different cultures. These differences are created and shaped by particular understandings of reality (Bohan, 2002).

2.5.2 Gender Essentialism

Whereas proponents of postmodernism conceptualise gender as socially constructed, gender essentialists move away from the social to the personal/individual to explain the concept of gender.

Gender essentialists conceptualise gender as a collection of personal characteristics and traits related to biological sex, which determine the personality, thoughts and moral disposition of an individual. From this perspective gender is an attribute that members of the same sex have in common. Thus all women share a 'feminine' experience of the world, in contrast to men who have a shared 'masculine' understanding (Bohan, 1993). With a gender essentialist point of reference, women theorists such as Nancy Chodorow in her *Reproduction of Mothering* (1978), Carol Gilligan in "*In a Different Voice*" (1982) and Miller in "*Toward a New Psychology of Women*" (1976), place emphasis on the differences between men and women. This emphasis was an attempt to reframe entrenched beliefs related to women's inferior status and was used in order to augment and enhance women and their qualities (Bohan, 2002). Thus, in an effort to acknowledge

and credit women, they deemed it necessary to highlight the fact that women were indeed different to men.

This approach has received widespread criticism as it assumes homogeneity of shared experience for women and men based on their sex. It is important that 'within-group' gender differences not be overlooked, that is, neither women nor men as a group, be regarded as homogenous (Deaux & LaFrance, 1998). Advocates of feminism, amongst others, have in the past theorised about women and women's experiences as the shared experience of all women (Richardson, 1996). This is also true of men, but theorists such as Connell (1995) have highlighted the existence of multiple masculinities that need to be recognised, and not merely a universal male experience. Clearly the assumption of homogeneity of experience ignores the different historical, political, cultural, social, occupational and individual contexts of women and of men, as well as completely ignoring any similarities between the sexes. Discounting social factors also increases the risk of victim-blaming as the restrictions placed on women essentially forces them into expected roles and the context is simply overlooked (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1990). A further weakness of this theory is that no consideration is given to the social context(s) in which gendered identities develop.

2.5.3 Context and its impact on becoming gendered

Imam (1997) defines gender as '*the knowledge that establishes meanings for bodily differences*' (p. 3). Further, such differences are not fixed and vary according to social

organization, culture and time. Gendered identities are thus specific to time and place. Understanding the process of becoming gendered, what constitutes masculinities and femininities, shifts with the 'when and where' of these identities. Thus what it means to be a woman or a man in the here and now, in South Africa in the Millennium, is not the same as in decades gone by, or in different countries and cultural settings. Culture is the cloak behind which numerous gender discriminatory practices and power tactics have historically hidden. By way of example, clitoridectomies performed in many African countries and binding of women's feet in China are examples of what were cited as cultural customs. Being a woman during the times when such practices were commonplace in these countries meant that such deformities for women were 'culturally prescribed'. Currently these practices are no longer valued and have changed, thus affecting and changing the experience of being a woman today (Meena, 1992).

The experience of becoming and being gendered is very different for females and males. This experience is also vastly different for women (and men) of different race, religious affiliation, socio-economic status and class, castes, countries, etc. and is part of the process of becoming 'socialised' or 'cultured' (Mama, 1997). Within the same society, gendered experiences are vastly different. In a South African context, women who grow up in rural areas as opposed to those who live in urban, middle-class areas will experience their shared gender very differently. Despite a growing awareness of "material conditions and their cultural corollaries" (Mama, 1997, p. 61), the gendered experiences of individual women remain immeasurably diverse.

Gendered experience informs who we are and is inextricably intertwined with our identities as gendered beings. We are born into existing structures of inequality between men and women (Meena, 1992) but we 'grow' into our respective gendered identities. In an African context reference is made to the lack of acknowledgement in the social sciences, of the role women have and still continue to play in society (Imam, 1997 & Meena, 1992). This reflects the lack of value women have been afforded as a function of their gender. To be born female and 'grow' into a woman in this context, is to be marginalized and undervalued. As such, the interplay between gender and other social strata, such as class, culture and context can be appreciated as complex and fluid.

2.6 GENDER DIFFERENCES

A fundamental consequence of gender differences in a gendered world, whether 'natural' or constructed, is the reality of every individual having to negotiate an identity within the confines of an assigned gender. Irrespective of whether such differences are a function of nature or nurture, our very existence is moulded by assumed personal traits, related to our biological sex, which cultivates our thinking processes, moral judgements, personalities and core identities (Bohan, 2002). What feminists have strived for is equality between the sexes. For some this process has involved downplaying or minimising differences, while others have elected to highlight them (Kitzinger, 1987). Irrespective, the end result has been that gender divisions remain and perpetuate the cycle of inequality (Lorber, 2000).

Normative practices are based on the assumption of essential differences between women and men (Lorber, 2000). As such, gender as difference is firmly entrenched and has been abundantly theorised.

2.6.1. A Theory of Socialisation

An alternative explanation to postmodernism, gender essentialism and becoming gendered in context, lies in that of socialised difference, or in the language of social psychology; “theory of differential socialisation” (Turner, 1991). That is, male and female children are not innately different, rather their differences manifest as a result of different opportunities and experiences (Goffman, 1977). Mechanisms of socialisation are pervasive and extend as far as the seemingly innocuous nursery rhymes that children sing. One such rhyme claims little girls are made of “sugar and spice and all things nice” and little boys are made of “frogs, snails and puppy dogs tails”. This teaches children from an early age that they are fundamentally different. The lesson is that girls epitomise sweetness and goodness and are thus kind and nurturing and function optimally in environments that promote co-operation. Boys, on the other hand, are adventurous and engage on quests that may be repulsive and detestable; they are more inclined toward situations of adversity and challenge (Kimmel, 1999). This ‘learning’ prepares both the girls and boys for normative expectations - girls are groomed for communal activities and boys to show agency (Eagly & Wood, 1991). Children are taught through differential reinforcement and modelling which behaviours, emotions, qualities, attributes, traits and interests are most valued for their allocated gender category.

In the home, which Goffman (1977) compares to a “socialization depot”, unquestioned, preconceived ideas translate into appropriate behaviour for boys and for girls. Boys and girls know their respective genders from very early and begin to watch and emulate behaviour of same-sex role models. An example of how boys and girls from Western middle-class backgrounds learn to express politeness is an apt illustration. Politeness for boys takes the form of gentlemanly behaviours especially towards women. These include active, helpful gestures that take women’s physical comfort and well-being into account. Thus men open doors, allow women to walk ahead and relieve them of the burden of having to carry items. Politeness for girls involves more nurturing gestures such as offering refreshments (Eagly & Wood, 1991). In the home, boys and girls are taught both verbally and through modelling which behaviours and attitudes are indicated and appropriate for their respective gender group.

Parenting is the arena in which gender stereotyping is most powerfully evoked. Longstanding practices of parenting leave the primary care-giving to the mother. In the United States of America the mother’s role in child rearing was so pronounced towards the end of the 1940’s and 1950’s that the mother and child were referred to as a ‘couple’ (Riley, 1983). Although there have been substantial changes in child rearing practices in contemporary Western society, women still carry most of the responsibility of child care (Hochschild, 1990). It is in this relationship between mother and child that a child develops his or her identity. A young girl’s identity is formed through connection with her mother, whereas a young boy forms his identity on separating from his mother. For girls,

core identity is defined through relationships and interactions and for boys, the definition of identity is centred on being a separate and independent individual (Chodorow, 1978 & Gilligan, 1982). With this as the starting point for the development of identity, it follows that gender labelling is employed to justify the allocation of differential treatment of male and female children. Boys are believed to 'naturally' have bigger appetites and are therefore fed more. Girls, on the other hand, are more sensitive and are therefore more often pampered. Through the enactment of such unquestioned and often unconscious behaviours, ideas and attitudes are passed on from parents to children, yet regarded as innate (Goffman, 1977). Further, Goffman (1977), suggests that it is within the family, consisting of boys and girls as siblings, that a training ground for interaction with the opposite sex is learnt and subsequently used in a broader social context.

Developing a gendered identity is a process that changes both with age and location. In the early years, this development takes place primarily in the home (Goffman, 1977), but with time peers, teachers, pop icons and the like influence and shape the continuing development of a gendered identity. As part of the process of negotiating a gendered identity, young girls typically experiment with what they understand to be 'womanly' or "try on" gender in a way that is not threatening or permanent (Williams, 2002). In a recent study conducted in the U.S.A., young girls were interviewed at age 13 before they underwent the transition into 'womanhood', and then again at ages 14, 15, and 19 years, that is after the transition into 'womanhood'. Initially the girls did not appear to be affected by the normative demands of 'womanhood'; they expressed disinterest in dieting, related body and appearance issues, fashion and boys. Maturation brought with it three

areas of concern that compelled conformity - attractiveness; attachment to men; and compliance and control. These same young girls believed that thin was beautiful, that they would be more popular if they had boyfriends and that as females they ought to listen to and accept the protection of men. The girls adhered to these gender norms for two main reasons. In the first place, attempts to violate these norms were met with punishment. In the second, many of these norms were framed enticingly. By way of example, control over daughters was framed as protectiveness and thus lured them into conformity (Williams, 2002).

Opinions about young males navigating their gendered courses vary. On the one hand, it is suggested that men are oblivious to their gender. Privilege precludes them from having to engage with what it means to be a man (Whitehead, 2001). In contrast, Faludi (1999) proposes that boys are compelled to hide their weaknesses and insecurities, which often takes the form of behaving insensitively and undermining others (women), in order to maintain their masculine images.

Gender is perceived not as a collection of measurable characteristics, but as actions and reactions that are socially appropriated, independent of the individual's biological sex (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1988, 1990). Thus gender (and sex) is not a question of difference or similarity, as much as it is a reflection of social expectation.

2.6.2 Social Science and Accentuating Difference

The emphasis on gender differences provides “a means to an end”, a way to legitimise and justify the gendered social orders (Lorber, 2000, p. 83). As such, there are constant attempts to legitimate gender differences that drive studies to prove hormonal or hereditary causes, or anything to explain/validate the origins of gender differences in behaviour (Lorber, 2000). There is a plethora of research hypothesising about gender differences in every possible arena, from attitudes and dispositions, to habits and personal expression. (This research is one such study). The spectrum of psychological research into gender differences extends from investigations into the different daydreaming styles of men and women (Golding & Singer, 1983), to whether women or men have a greater fear of spiders (Cornelius & Averill, 1983), to whether gender traits are desirable or undesirable (Riccardelli & Williams, 1995) to the gender stereotyping of emotional expression (Plant, Hyde, Keltner & Devine, 2000), and the list continues. The emphasis is always on difference rather than similarity (Pleck, 1981). Scales and other such tests to determine which gender has better capacity for skills such as logic or reason, or differences in attitudes and personality traits, are not uncommon.

It is apparent from the ongoing investigations into gender differences and the inherent acceptability of discussions and questions around how and why males and females differ, that male and female as opposites is an entrenched way of thinking. Our acceptance of terms such as ‘sex differences’ underpins our belief in these differences. Lack of support for differences between the sexes may be bewildering rather than providing evidence of

similarities between the sexes (Deaux, 1985). Any research into the understanding of the male - female dichotomy causes it to be constantly reinforced and legitimised (Bohan, 2002). Even feminists are accused of challenging hierarchical structures and sex roles, but not actual difference (Delphy, 1993). Essentially, although advocates of feminism have been striving for equality of the sexes, gender divisions remain intact and unchallenged (Lorber, 2000). One theorist, Sandra Bem (1993), however, challenges the concept of difference in relation to gender. She asserts that male - female division organises culture and consciousness. She therefore asserts that it is difference itself that needs to be disassembled.

Kate Millet (1977) argues that it is the social psychologists who have facilitated the creation of the ideology of sex role differences. Social psychologists have spent decades confirming essential differences between women and men. Based on these assumptions and countless others, there have been extensive cataloguing and investigating of the different normative behaviours for each sex. This process has resulted in the formation of one set of attributes that defines men and another to define women. Thus, the differences between males and females that have been attributed to science or 'nature' may be nothing more than comments on how men and women *should* behave, think and feel (De Beauvoir, 1989). Nikolas Rose's concept of 'regimes of truth' - allows practices, thoughts and ideas to be true at particular times in our history (1999, p xiv). Disciplines such as psychology produce knowledge that is believed to be true and in turn allows expansion of these 'truths'. Ideas become accepted, entrenched, reproduced and

elaborated (Rose, 1999). Thus in the case of gender, social scientific research itself has helped to construct and perpetuate these differences.

2.6.3 Gender and Power

Conceptualising gender in terms of difference and inequality, or similarity and equality, once again overlooks the social context within which gender is enacted (Scott, 1988).

This is supported by the argument that the belief in gender differences, whether intrinsic or socially constructed, is a justification for differential treatment for men and women and often results in the oppression of women (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1988).

“Discrimination is ignoring sameness when it is salient and ignoring difference when it is salient” (Kimmel, 1999, p. 499). Differences in biological make-up are used to explain differences in ability, which in turn are used to validate the need for different standards and treatment of men and women. However, the belief in the absence of differences between men and women may also prejudice women, if ‘different’ and ‘equal’ are seen as polarities. The opposite of ‘difference’ is ‘sameness’, but in practice, if women are considered to be no different from men, then they are assumed to be equal to men, rather than the same as men (Scott, 1988).

There is a significantly higher value attached to masculinity than femininity. As such, masculinity dominates linguistically, practically and symbolically; conceptually, it provides a privileged means of gender importance (Butler, 1990). Throughout history

power has not been constantly held by either men or women, but has changed depending on particular family structures, politics and economic circumstances. However, this variable dynamic only affected individual men and women (Lorber, 2000). On a broader, social level, men have always occupied positions of power. Connell (1995) conceptualises masculine power as economic power, with the distribution of resources being heavily weighted on the male side, to the detriment of women. This was mainly due to men having access to resources as part of the paid labour force while women remained in the home. Further, he asserts that power and privilege are afforded to men as a function of their genderedness. Power as directly related to access to material resources is reiterated by Lorber (2000) who points out that the ownership of property and inheritance can alter the balance of power. Again, this may be true in exceptional cases, but power is more than material means, it is embedded within a greater gendered structure (Eisenstein, 1984).

Economic strength is the major source of power, even though male supremacy permeates every aspect of public and private living (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1996). It is thus essential to understand the dynamics within the workplace in order to appreciate the wider social context. Currently men outnumber women in management positions (Whitehead, 2001). There is an entrenched masculine work culture which is a function of “the dominant epistemological form in organisations [being] highly gendered, structured as it has been by the partial, incomplete but dominant understandings and perspectives of countless men” (Whitehead, 2001, p 79). It is apparent that men eliminate the threat women pose by excluding them (Kimmel, 1987 & Faludi, 1999). It is more than the

presence of women that is threatening to men; it is their equality (Faludi, 1999). Women are present in all-male institutions as cleaners and cooks, but not as active participants. Subservient and deferent positions, such as secretaries and nurses have traditionally been held by women who help or assist the men in charge, the bosses and doctors (Kimmel, 1987). Currently, women and men occupy similar positions in the workplace with more women doing what was previously considered to be men's work, yet segregation by gender is still intact (Jacobs, 1995). This can be traced back to the 1970's when women began working in male dominated environments. These environments were gradually transformed into female environments as the male workers vacated their positions (Reskin & Padavic, 1994). Equality in the workplace was thus illusory. The positions that opened up for women were those no longer desired by men. In this way women were under the impression that they had achieved equal status to men, but in reality men were still manipulating and controlling the work sphere. Thus genderedness in the working world was essentially unchanged (Lorber, 2000), and equal opportunity for men and women was little more than the flavour of the day, without more meaningful cultural changes (Whitehead, 2001).

In light of social and legal imperatives that have created the current climate of gender equality, there is a danger of minimising the complex interplay between gender and power (Connell, 1995). In practice, just as all 'men' are not equal, neither are men and women equal. Men support the notion of equality when their traditional gender privileges are upheld (Kimmel, 1999), yet, American research findings indicate a general decrease in prejudice (Crandall, Eshelman & O'Brien, 2002). Notwithstanding these findings, the

researchers question to what extent the decrease in prejudice is a function of real shifts in attitudes and to what extent it “reflects internalisation of prevailing social norms” that are merely adhered to without being a reflection of the individual’s personal beliefs and principles (Crandall, et. al., 2002, p 360). Prejudice and discrimination were found to be infrequent when measured overtly, but not as infrequent when measured “unobtrusively” (Crandall, et. al., 2002). Despite legal obligations and social norms to change attitudes and practise gender equality, the balance of power, both private and public, is not divided equally between men and women.

It appears that true shifts or internalisation of attitudes towards gender equality have not been integrated into everyday life. A recent study found that at management level what was spoken was merely a “*language of equal opportunities*” (Whitehead, 2001, p. 70). Equal opportunity as a concept and as a reality was at odds. Equal opportunity as a reality requires a “personal and cultural shift beyond policy documents and advertising jargon” (Whitehead, 2001, p. 70). However, in order for sexual equality and equity to become a reality, both males and females have to have self-insight to understand the significance of their gender in either assisting or impeding equal opportunity for women. In this study, the self-insight that the women possessed was absent in the male respondents, who were largely unaware that they were gendered subjects. Both males and females require ‘self-reflexivity’, insight and awareness of the significance their gender has in order for a shift in gender power and opportunity to occur (Whitehead, 2001).

2.7 GENDER NORMATIVE BEHAVIOURS AND CONFORMITY

In everyday practice, prescribed gender appropriate behaviour is translated into that which is considered 'normal' behaviour (Kimmel & Messner, 1992; West & Zimmerman, 1991). Gender divisions provide structure in our daily lives, from a personal sense of who we are to how we interact with one another, our places in our respective families, how our work is organised, political and religious beliefs, legal and medical practice (Lorber, 2000).

Individuals often behave in accordance with prescribed gender norms (Von Hippel, Hawkins & Schooler, 2001). Numerous theories have been postulated in an attempt to understand the mechanisms that elicit conformity to social (gender) norms. To this end, three such theories, namely cognitive schemas, normative and informational influence, and compliance, identification and internalisation will be discussed.

2.7.1 Theories of Conformity

2.7.1.1 Cognitive Schemas

A range of different theories has been offered to understand the mechanisms at work that encourage conformity. One such theory involves the use of cognitive schemas (Augoustinos & Walker, 1995). A schema is a cognitive configuration made up of a complex system of associations that shapes perception. It is the product of new information superimposed on pre-existing information (Bem, 1981). Thus, the accepted

gender stereotypes that individuals hold act as gender schemas for the cognitive categorisation of gender and gender appropriate roles and behaviours. Subsequent responses to experiences or events trigger existing schemas, which then shape how the new information is noticed, recalled and interpreted. The more recent and recurrent the schema, the more accessible it is and the more likely it is to be used. Fiske (1998) refers to a frequently used schema as a 'permanently primed' schema. Gender is such a schema. Even the most mundane behaviours such as housework or smoking cigars, have a place as either gender appropriate or inappropriate. In addition to the vast number of daily actions that keep gender schemas permanently primed, media, literature and subtle messages from society also reinforce this priming. By asking questions about gender appropriate behaviours, the current research is a further example of how existing gender schemas remain permanently primed. The same is true of other studies such as that carried out by McCarl-Nielsen, Walden and Kunkel (2000), which continued over a period of fifteen years. In so doing, these researchers contributed to keeping the gender schemas of their student participants permanently primed for the duration of the study. Burn (1996) contends that the differences between women and men in reality are not nearly as vast as the *perceived* differences. However, this inclination to overestimate gender difference is, in part, a function of the natural strategies we employ to process information such as through the use of schemas.

2.7.1.2 Normative and Informational Influence

Another explanation of the processes which underlie social conformity is the theory formulated by Deutsch and Gerard in the mid 1950's of *normative* and *informational influence* (1955). According to this theory individuals conform to the expectations of others because of the need to be accepted and liked and not be rejected or ridiculed. This is referred to as 'normative influence'. This influence often occurs together with 'informational influence', which is borne out of the individual's desire to be right. Individuals depend on social information to learn and acquire knowledge about themselves and their worlds, as well as to ascertain which attitudes are considered appropriate in relation to a range of social issues. This would be applicable to appropriate gender attitudes and behaviours. Members of each gender would presumably conform to normative standards prescribed for their respective gender in order to gain acceptance. The social information provided to them would dictate behaviours suitable for their gender. Thus, conformity is a 'social guidebook' without which individuals would struggle to make sense of themselves and their thoughts and feelings about the world they inhabit (Turner, 1991). Cialdini & Trost (1998) refer to this concept of determining what is acceptable by watching and evaluating the responses of others as eliciting "social proof". Such proof, he claims, is also "cognitively economical" as it lessens the thinking-load of each individual.

2.7.1.3 Normative Prescriptions

Aronson (1976) argues that individuals conform in response to 'normative prescriptions'. These are *compliance*, *identification* and *internalisation*. He argues that conformity due to compliance is motivated by punishment and reward, that is, individuals conform to what is expected of them in order to receive social rewards or to avoid social punishment. Individuals who adopt compliance strategies are reacting to another person or group of people more powerful than themselves who are able to punish or reward their behaviour. Compliance is temporary and unlikely to outlast the promise of reward or the threat of punishment.

Conformity due to identification results from the individual's desire to emulate a person she or he respects and admires. Children often identify with older, same-sex role models and are inclined to adopt their behaviours and attitudes. The mechanism underlying identification is the attractiveness of the influencer to the individual and thus identification will motivate conformity as long as the influencer remains an attractive role model.

The third, most permanent of these processes is that of internalisation. Internalisation is born out of an individual's desire to be right and this response is adopted when the prescriptive norm is considered credible. These norms are then integrated into the individual's own value system and external scrutiny or monitoring is unwarranted.

Aronson concedes that in reality these responses often overlap and are difficult to distinguish from one another.

2.7.2 Summary: Theories of Conformity

The issue of conformity as well as the motivation to conform are complex. Individuals in the Western World apparently have free choice. Women and men are supposedly free to choose how they wish to behave, and whether or not they would like to adhere to the many ideals of femininity or masculinity. Women can reject femininity or feminine beauty as defined by the masculine order. Men too are able to object and resist traditional notions of masculinity. Why then do women and men 'elect' to conform? Perhaps this freedom is little more than a concept, which women (and men) do not really feel (Frye, 1983; Gavey, 1989 & West & Zimmerman, 1991). Bartky (1990) suggests that it is patriarchal powers that have positioned women as their own prison wardens. Women and men who do not conform face victimisation and are thus compelled to earn and maintain their status as acceptable 'normal' women or men in accordance with accepted standards (Bartky, 1990 & Connell, 1995, Eagly & Mladinic, 1989). Preservation of the status quo, maintenance of masculine power, or conformity, is rewarded through social acceptance, approval and positive labelling (Butler, 1990).

2.8 GENDER PRACTICE AND POLICING

Gender dictates every aspect of our daily lives. It dictates what we wear, how we sit, how we walk, how much we are allowed to eat, how loudly we may speak, the sports we may play, the jobs we choose, our level of involvement in household chores and child rearing (Bartky, 1990). Gender is so pervasive that even the amount of emotional expression permitted, as well as the appropriate contexts, is also prescribed (Milkie, 2002).

Conformity to gender normative behaviours is maintained through careful monitoring. Women and men not only police each other, but also monitor the behaviour of members of the opposite sex. This monitoring is not necessarily overt, but subtle criticism, negative labelling, rumours and the like, 'force' women and men to behave appropriately (Gavey, 1989).

2.8.1 Consequences of Crossing Gender Boundaries

Gendered behaviours are socially sanctioned and policed for both genders. There are social repercussions for non-conformity and violation of gender norms including the risk of "social disapproval" (Hegstrom & McCarl-Nielsen, 2002, p. 227). Often these repercussions are so feared that individuals who are unable to internalise group norms will suppress their opinions or thoughts if they are at variance with accepted practices (Crandall et al., 2002). Frye (1983, p. 38) refers to the "double bind" that women find themselves in; their options are not only limited, but also invite "penalty, censure or deprivation".

Permissible behaviour for male and female children is enforced from childhood, as evidenced by the gendered nature of children's play. Certain games and activities are marked as either boys' or girls' games. Any child who does not adhere to the gender rules of play, risks being teased or ostracised. Girls who play boys' games are labelled as 'tomboys' and boys who prefer to play girls' games are accused of being 'girls' (Thorne, 1992). Similarly, in adulthood, even in the absence of a formal policing system, there are repercussions for crossing the socially engineered gender boundaries. Direct force is not necessary; women and men alike conform to gender normative roles. A myriad of societal mechanisms are at play that ensure appropriate gender practice. These include behaviour, language, longstanding rituals and traditions, etiquette and education, which are pervasive weapons insidiously infused into our everyday lives that elicit appropriate gender practice and acceptance (Rich, 1986).

Historically, men have been the lawmakers and enforcers, not only in public and legal arenas, but also in social and personal realms (Kitzinger, 1991). Thus, the laws of gender and gendered behaviour are man-made. These laws are highly specific and prescriptive and the allocated appropriate attributes are translated into what is expected of both men and women. Such attributes are examples of how women and men are supposed to behave, think and feel, and form the basis of normative female and male stereotypes. Given that such qualities are 'normal' for either gender, and that deviation from these norms is met with social censure, it is not surprising that both men and women aspire to be or become what a 'normal' woman or man should be (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). Prescriptions dictated by sex govern the very essence of who we are, what we think and

how we feel (Kimmel & Messner, 1992; West & Zimmerman, 1991). The fear of social rejection, negative labelling and ostracism also play a significant role in motivating individual compliance.

Life is 'simpler' for those who embrace the 'normality' of mainstream values, culture and behaviour. Therefore, it is probably adaptive for both women and men to internalise gender roles in order to fit in and be accepted. Successful internalisation of gender norms translates into acceptable social practice and the individual thus achieves the status of being well-adjusted (West & Zimmerman, 1991). However, historical changes in gender role expectations have resulted in these roles being inconsistent and even contradictory over time. An example is that of women retaining their traditional roles as mothers and homemakers in combination with a more modern, professional role. Similarly, men suffer from sex role strain as a result of the internalisation of stereotypical male behaviours and norms that are no longer consistent with their modern roles (Pleck 1981).

2.3.2 Men and Gender Boundary Violations

Despite the dictates for either gender often being on opposite poles, the obligation to conform is shared. However, given that they are the patriarchs, in positions of privilege and power, the effects and restrictions that gender places on men may be less obvious. Patriarchy is best viewed as a dual system wherein men are the oppressors of women as well as of other men (Pleck, 1992) Being gendered also compels men to behave, think and feel in accordance with that which is deemed gender appropriate. By virtue of their

gender, men are supposed to be competitive by nature. Thus, in order to be 'real' men and maintain their masculine status, men are obliged to compete with one another. It is not surprising that despite being in power as a gendered group, individual men feel weak. (Pleck, 1992).

Both urban legend and popular media reinforce the concept of the 'real man'. In Western culture, this 'real man' is white, middle class and heterosexual, who in his youth is physically strong and athletically able. In later life, financial success and securing an attractive woman/wife are highly esteemed. By way of example, a recent study found that women favoured men with "good earning potential" (Johannesen-Schmidt & Eagly, 2002). The need for men to achieve symbols of their worth would logically increase their competitiveness. Men relate to one another as competitors and are thus unable to show vulnerability and weakness. Weakness is the domain of women and any man who shows such weakness is woman-like or gay, which is the most serious threat to masculinity. Thus, men often have to prove their strength by dominating others. Heterosexual men subjugate gay men while middle-aged men wield their power over the young and the elderly. Upper class men tend to exploit men of working class and white men oppress black men (Eisenstein, 1984). Essentially the ideals of masculinity are difficult to achieve and many men who have internalised such markers of male success, are left with feelings of failure. 'Real men' are fighters, and any man who does not partake in the fight for success threatens the very essence of masculinity. This forms the basis of men monitoring, censoring and policing one another (Pleck, 1985).

Faludi (1999) offers a different perspective. According to her theory, based on observing middle class men in a military institution, men 'obey' the dictates of normative male gendered behaviours to avoid shaming or demeaning themselves in front of women. This motivates the exclusion of women and forms the basis for all-male institutions; men are able to show their vulnerabilities to other men without fear of embarrassment. This inability for males to acknowledge vulnerability or weakness in the presence of women has been blamed on women, who have been equated with a "toxic kind of virus", for their mere presence, which inhibits male expression and emotion (Kimmel, 1999, p. 502)

2.8.3 Women and Gender Boundary Violations

A logical assumption would be that men as the architects of patriarchy and the oppressors of women would naturally assume the roles of gender police. However, it is not only men who monitor gender normative behaviours; women too play a significant part in this social policing system. As gendered members of society women (and men) are governed by unwritten rules that are not legally enforceable; they are adhered to and practiced with every woman (and man) acting as a "self-policing subject" (Bartky, 1990, p. 80). One point of view is that women have internalised the value systems imposed on them as some components have proved to be advantageous. Effectively, they have entered into a plea bargain, albeit an unspoken one, wherein public power has been relinquished in exchange for private power in the home (Pleck, 1985). Many of these internalised values are perpetuated by mothers who, according to Chodorow (1978), play a key role in the rearing of children and the teaching of longstanding gender normative behaviours.

Another understanding of how traditional gendered behaviours are preserved and maintained in Western societies where women are educated, well resourced, with access to both civil and political rights and are not directly coerced or forced to assume their gender roles is offered by Millett (1977). She argues that traditional gendered behaviours are rooted in gender role stereotyping, engineered by advocates of patriarchy, and a form of social control of women. The form this social control takes is not one of force or authoritarianism, but rather one of manipulation and eliciting consent among women themselves. This position is supported by Bartky who states that the “disciplinary power that inscribes femininity in the female body is everywhere and it is nowhere; the disciplinarian is everyone and yet no one in particular” (1990. p. 74). Perhaps this social control is most obvious in the arena of the female ideal of beauty.

In a society where feminine beauty is prized, women are judged and judge themselves on their physical presentation. Naomi Wolf (1991) refers to this concept of beauty as a “currency system” which, like any economic system is politically dictated in order to serve and satisfy the needs of those in power (men). With this precondition for acceptability as the background context, numerous women participate in ‘self-imposed’ regimes of beauty punishment. Time-consuming and painstaking routines are followed in order to meet the prerequisites of being valued as a woman, that is, being beautiful. In reality, these practices are not engaged in as free agents, but rather as prisoners or victims of this ‘freedom’. That women partake in these fastidious practices highlights not only the strength of their self-criticism but also their fear of being criticised by others. Yet, in spite of this ‘natural’ sense of vanity, and the attendant commitment it demands, it does not

command admiration. Instead “women are ridiculed and dismissed for the triviality of their interest in such ‘trivial’ things such as clothes and make-up” (Bartky, 1990, p.73). In addition women are accused of being self-involved. Narcissism is ostensibly understood as a central attitudinal female trait. At least that is what mainstream society believes and tends to encourage (de Beauvoir, 1989).

This female preoccupation with beauty or self-obsession has been criticised as both racist and classist: it is a (white) middle class luxury that (black) working class women cannot afford (Langston, 1998). In a South African context, those black women who do have access to resources are ‘encouraged’ to pursue the ideal of superior ‘white’ beauty. By way of example, a range of chemical products is marketed to assist black women in changing their hair texture and colour in order to look more beautiful (presumably like white women) (Meena, 1992).

Thus women are labelled as intrinsically narcissistic beings whose very essence of being is threatened by other, potentially more glamorous women. Given that women are jealous of one another, whether by ‘nature’ or by deliberate set-up (Schopenhauer, 1949), the remark that “the worst rival of a woman bonded in patriarchy is another woman”, is not surprising. (Kayoka, 2001). Women’s ‘natural’ enmity has been attributed to their fear of competition and therefore they see each other as rivals. Schopenhauer. (1949). This viewpoint resonates with that of Kayoka (2001) who comments that there is an entrenched belief amongst women that they are their own deceivers and enemies. The internalisation of such beliefs would understandably make women more wary and critical

of one another. A woman's status and value is bound to her ability to secure a male partner. Once found though, men may stray and women then have to "tame" husbands or lovers. This "taming" is a woman's attempt to safeguard her man from "lusty, jealous and wily fellow women" (Kayoka, 2001, p. 20). The competitive nature of women's relationships with one another encourages the adoption of critical and unforgiving attitudes. It is interesting to note that culpability rests firmly on the shoulders of women. Men who "fail to control their sexual desires" are absolved of any responsibility (Kayoka, 2001, p. 20). Thus it may be argued that women are not 'naturally' jealous or competitive, they criticize, blame and compete with one another as a function of their conditioning and socialisation.

Ironically, women who embody femininity with its attendant focus on subordinate behaviours such as deference to male authority and dependency, achieve the status of being well-adjusted and 'normal'. Those who refuse to internalise such behaviours and traits, leave themselves open to anything from criticism and social ostracism to psychiatric diagnoses and violence (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). On the other hand, over-identification with these norms may also lead to 'pathologisation' or victimisation, thus placing women in the proverbial double bind (Gavey, 1993).

The interactions involved in same-sex and cross-sex social censure, as well as the relationships between individual women and men negotiating their worlds within the confines of genderedness are complex and intricately woven into the fabric of everyday communications, relations and exchanges (Kitzinger, 1987).

Research (Tang & Tang, 2001) has shown a link between women's internalisation of gender roles and mental health problems including depression, eating disorders, agoraphobia, chronic fatigue syndrome and somatization. However, violations of these gender roles may also result in negative psychological effects.

2.3.4 Heterosexuality and Homosexuality

Current thinking, influenced by feminist ideas and principles, as well as constitutional changes, does not appear to have shifted traditional gender stereotyped thinking to a significant extent (Fiske, 1998). It is apparent that gender stereotyped thinking has not abated. Appropriate behaviour for women as mothers and chief domestic charges has been integrated into normal female gender roles. Men are still perceived as more involved in economic pursuits and are therefore naturally responsible for providing for their families (Jacobs, 1995). In a recent research study carried out by Johannesen-Schmidt and Eagly (2002) to assess the relationship between endorsing the traditional gender roles and desired characteristics in a partner, expectations consistent with longstanding gender stereotypes were produced. Men were looking for partners who fitted the gender appropriate criteria of being young and domestically competent. Women, on the other hand, favoured older, financially successful men. Thus that which has been labelled as gender-appropriate is valued in the opposite sex and the stereotypical ideals of both masculinity and femininity remain desired characteristics. It is apparent that our genderedness has significant bearing on our lives and our life choices: in addition, heterosexuality is 'normal'.

It is accepted that both men and women have a combination of masculine and feminine traits, however, in 'normal' men the masculine characteristics are dominant and in 'normal' women, feminine traits dominate (Biernat, 1991). Homosexuality is beyond the scope of this research, but suffice to say that it disrupts the absolute understanding of what men and women respectively are, and is therefore a noteworthy gender violation. A myriad of studies exist which attempt to ascertain if homosexuality is, even in part, a result of women possessing too many masculine traits, or men being too feminine (Kimmel & Messner, 1992). Research findings suggest that deviation from gender norms is more likely to raise questions of homosexuality in men than in women (Whitehead, 2001). A possible explanation is proposed by the "inversion theory of sexuality". According to this theory, members of each gender assume that homosexual members are comparable to members of the opposite sex. As such, if a man behaves in traditionally female ways, the assumption is that he is homosexual (Deaux & Major, 1987). Therefore, conformity to gender norms protects an individual from the possibility of negative labelling (Burn, 1996).

In the workplace, men who defy gender norms by doing 'women's work' "face institutionalised challenges to their sense of masculinity" (Henson & Rogers, 2001, p. 218). As recently as the 1960's, the typically feminised temporary clerical work, or "Girl Friday" positions were considered inappropriate for men by colleagues and bosses, as well as by the temporary industry itself. This was reflected in company policies that excluded male applicants. Company policies have since been amended, but the expectations are still that applicants will be attractive, deferent and engage in care-taking

activities; that is a typically female applicant. By crossing gender boundaries in the working world, the “presumed heterosexuality” of such men is questioned (Henson & Rogers, 2001, p. 219).

Bem (1981) asserts that heterosexuality is the quintessence of femininity and masculinity. Further, contravention of the heterosexuality norm is enough to call into question the individual’s adequacy as either a man or a woman. The high social value attached to heterosexuality may lead individuals to prize their heterosexuality and thus not engage in behaviours that may cast aspersions on their sexuality. Violations of gender norms invariably result in women being labelled as promiscuous (McCarl-Nielsen et al., 2000), and to a lesser extent calls their sexuality into question. However, men who cross gender normative behaviours jeopardise their masculinity as male gender violations are almost synonymous with homosexuality (Kimmel & Messner, 1992).

2.9 McCARL-NIELSEN ET AL. AND “INAPPROPRIATE GENDERED BEHAVIOUR”

McCarl-Nielsen, Walden and Kunkel (2000) conducted a research study looking particularly at gender norm violations. This study was carried out over a fifteen-year period. (1975 - 1990) as part of the curriculum for the gender studies classes the authors ran. In contrast to the present research study, McCarl-Nielsen’s methodology was primarily qualitative and employed narrative analysis of the data. Each student registered for the course was required to pair up with a fellow student acting as an ‘observer’, while

she or he publicly violated a selected gender norm. The aim was to assess the response of those witnessing this violation of accepted gender-appropriate behaviour. The students then documented their experience of the events, the context, the verbal and non-verbal reactions of others, as well as their own thoughts and feelings. The observer also documented his/her experience of the event.

Thematic analysis of the behaviours based on the students' experiences and observations was performed. The behaviours were then coded into four "Norm Violation Categories", each containing a list of behaviours. (Full list reproduced in Appendix 1). The four categories conceptualised were:

1. Women's Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour,
2. Women's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour,
3. Men's Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour,
4. Men's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour.

McCarl-Nielsen et. al. "identified sexual interpretations of what appeared to be not inherently sexual actions" during their analysis of the data. The term "unexplicitly sexual" refers to behaviours that are not overtly sexual in nature but may be considered appealing by certain people. The example given is that of a man smoking a cigar. While this is not offensive or perverted, it may be seen as "sexy" (p.285). In contrast, a man who approaches a woman in a bar and buys a drink for her is considered to be "a polite sexual overture" and thus termed "explicitly sexual" by the authors (p 286). One form of social censure is the negative labelling that result from these deviations. An example from this

study is that violation of gender norms was often interpreted and labelled as sexualised behaviour. Women, who usurp traditionally masculine roles such as asking a man to dance, were considered promiscuous and men, who show a keen interest in clothing, skin-care and their appearance, risk being labelled homosexual.

Each of the above-mentioned categories was constructed according to the gender of the norm violator and the specific behaviour, for example, women repairing cars, women wearing men's clothing, men carrying handbags, men reading romance novels (McCarl-Nielsen et al., 2000). The respective behaviours were listed in order of the frequency (See Appendix 1).

Premised on this study and the "norm violation categories" they employed, a concise measuring instrument in the form of a questionnaire was designed by the researcher, specifically to assess South African students' attitudes to gender norm violations. Two questionnaires were drawn up. Both questionnaires posed the same questions, however in the second questionnaire the gender was reversed. Thus the first question posed was how the respective respondents felt about two *women* fighting, the second questionnaire asked how the respondents felt about two *men* fighting. The aim of the second questionnaire was to control for potential confounding variables, for example, violence. Is the behaviour completely unacceptable because *women* are fighting, or is the objection against violence, thus *anyone* fighting would be unacceptable.

2.10 CONCLUSION:

It is apparent that “[p]eople believe women and men to differ in most of the ways they are supposed to differ” (Prentice & Carranza, 2002, p. 275). Gender differences are socially constructed and practiced, as are the normative behaviours and standards for each gender category. The centrality of gender, gender difference and genderedness is evidenced in how gender appropriate behaviours are prescribed in virtually all spheres of our daily lives and activities. These behaviours are socially sanctioned and policed by both genders. Non-conformity is punished; women are labelled as sexually promiscuous and men as homosexual. It appears that attitudinal shifts are slow, that traditional gender biases still prevail despite the legal and constitutional prescriptions of gender equality and non-discrimination.

This study was designed to assess whether such longstanding gender biased attitudes still exist in a young, middle-class student population. In addition the study aimed to examine responses to gender norm violations, as well as ascertain who polices gender conformity. Do women police the behaviour of other women and men monitor one another’s behaviour, or is there cross gender policing?

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

3.1 METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the study design and method used. The data was collected quantitatively with the use of questionnaires. The content of the questionnaires was based on a research study conducted by McCarl-Nielsen et al. (2000) and is detailed below.

3.1.1 Survey Methodology

The research study employed a survey methodology. The objective of such a design is to provide a descriptive account of behaviours and/or attitudes of a particular population group (Robson, 1993).

3.1.2 Measuring Attitudes

Allport (1968) referred to the concept of attitudes as the bedrock of social psychology. There are differing views of this concept and therefore no single definition. Ajzen (1988, 2001) considered an attitude to be a theoretical construct that is learned or acquired by an individual, which is a relatively unchanging and stable aspect of their temperament. Anastasi defines an attitude as “a tendency to react favourably or unfavourably to a designated class of stimuli, such as a national or ethnic group, a custom or an institution

(1990, p. 584). Further, she points out that attitudes are not directly observable and can only be inferred through behaviour, both verbal and non-verbal. For the purposes of this study, attitudes were conceptualised as comparatively fixed learned concepts or ideas that can be deduced through behaviour.

The selected research instrument was an Attitude Scale (Anastasi, 1990). Such a scale allows the researcher to quantify the strength and fervour of an individual's attitude about the topic under discussion. In keeping with the accepted construction of Attitude Scales, each question was designed to "measure a single attitude or unidimensional variable" (p.584).

3.1.3 Questionnaires

Questionnaires were selected because they are considered to be a relatively time-effective, inexpensive means of accessing a large sample group. The results can then be generalised to a larger population (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 1996). In a South African context where resources are limited, these are important considerations. It is estimated that more than three quarters of Social Psychology research data in South Africa is collected using questionnaires (Tyson, 1991). In addition, questionnaires are impersonal and the researcher felt that participants might feel freer to answer more truthfully if their identities remained unknown (Tyson, 1991). As this study was an exploratory one, and this type of instrument lends itself to collecting information from a large sample group in

a short space of time, it was considered to be an effective and appropriate research instrument.

3.1.4 Likert Scales

The scale used was a Likert Scale, which is a widely used, standardised measure using item analysis (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 1996). This scale is fairly simple to construct and has good reliability (Anastasi, 1990). It is presented as a numerical attitude scale with the different numbers on the scale corresponding with a particular response (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 1996). Most Likert Scales have five response categories: “strongly agree (SA), agree (A), undecided (U), disagree (D), and strongly disagree (DA)” (Anastasi, 1990, p. 586). However, the Likert Scale used in this research comprised six response categories so as to eliminate the 'undecided' response (See Appendices 2 & 3).

3.1.5 Limitations of Methodology

The selected methodology does not allow for in-depth analysis of the data. Respondents merely rate the attitudes on a scale and the origins and reasons for their attitudes are unknown. The information is ‘factual’ (Creswell, 1994). In addition, respondents may think that certain behaviours are appropriate or inappropriate on a theoretical level, however, the reality of witnessing people behaving in ways that are contrary to accepted gender norms, may elicit deep-rooted attitudes that differ from these abstract thoughts and beliefs.

The questionnaires were administered in English as the sample group attend an English University. However, numerous respondents did not speak English as their first language. The questionnaire does not account for lack of fluency, or varying levels of fluency in English, which may affect responses to certain questions. The researcher is unable to engage with participants or explain nuances and subtleties as one might when conducting an interview.

Certain examples were class and culture bound such as “throwing a tupperware party”. This would probably not be fully comprehensible to an individual who is not from a middle-class background and not familiar with the Westernised tradition of this retail practice.

3.2 RESEARCH INSTRUMENT:

3.2.1 McCarl-Nielsen, Walden & Kunkel Study (2000)

This research was based on a qualitative study done by McCarl-Nielsen, Walden & Kunkel (2000) assessing attitudes to gender norm violations. Their study was a long-term research project that continued over a fifteen-year period. The participants in the McCarl-Nielsen et al study (2000) publicly enacted violations of accepted gender norms and recorded their experiences as well as the responses of those who witnessed their gender inappropriate behaviours. Following in-depth thematic analysis the gender norm violations were categorised into four groups namely:

- Women's Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour - behaviours that are not overtly sexual in nature but may be considered sexually appealing by certain people.
- Women's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour - behaviours that are overtly sexual in nature.
- Men's Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour - behaviours that are not overtly sexual in nature but may be considered sexually appealing by certain people.
- Men's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour - behaviours that are overtly sexual in nature.

The McCarl-Nielsen (2000) instrument was considered suitable for adaptation for research in the present context and was thus modified into a questionnaire using content items from each of the four categories outlined above (See Appendix 1). The long-term duration of their study provides thorough analysis of the data and comprehensive arguments. In addition, the non-normative gendered behaviours cited were recognisable and appropriate in a South African context and it seemed possible to transpose these behaviours without violating social or cultural norms if the study was conducted on a similar population group i.e. a predominantly white, middle class student population in a university environment. Such a population group was readily accessible for this study. It was also possible to adapt this study to fit the constraints of the current context and draw up a questionnaire based on the categorisation of these behaviours as stipulated by McCarl-Nielsen et al (2000) in their study.

3.2.2 Adaptation of the Research Instrument

The contents of each of McCarl-Nielsen's categories were carefully examined. Those, which were inappropriate in a South African context, were eliminated. One such example is "go shiftless in sports context". Statements which were unlikely to be relevant to this age sample were eliminated, for example; "Buy, rent, ask about construction products" as most students were assumed either to be living at home, in residence, or in rented accommodation, and would be unlikely to be involved in home maintenance or building. A number of behaviours that were not heteronormative (behaviours of heterosexual people that are considered to be 'normal'), such as a man "carry[ing] a purse" (or as South African's would understand it, a bag), were eliminated, as both male and female students would be likely to carry bags. Discretion was used to eliminate examples that were arbitrary in nature and/or inappropriate.

At the end of the elimination phase, only culturally relevant and potentially useful examples were retained. Certain behaviours were modified or converted to a language that students would be more able to relate to or understand, for example, "Put ad in paper for man". University students are unlikely to read classified or place adverts in such a medium. They are however more likely to make use of computer chat rooms and datelines, hence this was modified to ask whether or not it was acceptable to advertise on 'dateline.com'. Rather than enactment, all examples were phrased as vignettes describing the behaviours in a university context, such as having the encounters take place on the university campus, Jamison Steps, or at well-known student bars or restaurants.

Initially five examples of gender violating behaviours were selected from each category in order to be adequately representative. However, there were significantly more examples defined in the category “Women’s Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour” in McCarl-Nielsen’s study. Therefore an extra question was allocated to this category (See Appendix 1).

The Likert Scale was modified to a six point scale so as not to allow the participants a neutral response such as ‘undecided’. This is acceptable research practice (Anastasi, 1990) and was based on the supposition that respondents may be more inclined to select a neutral response, if one was available, rather than have to think and commit themselves to an opinion. The researcher was aware that this might not be an accurate reflection of respondents’ attitudes, as they would be forced to make choices, even in instances where they did not have strong opinions. (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 1996)

Respondents were asked to rate how appropriate they considered brief scenarios on a six point scale where ‘completely acceptable’ = 1 and ‘completely unacceptable’ = 6.

According to Tyson (1991), such a rating scale is a well-recognised way to obtain scores. After careful deliberation and lengthy debate with peer professionals and supervisors, the researcher chose to use the words ‘acceptable/unacceptable’ on the Likert Scale in order to ensure that the wording would convey the correct meaning. The words ‘appropriate/inappropriate’, ‘usual/unusual’ and ‘agree/disagree’ were not selected because the researcher felt these alternatives did not assess the respondents’ actual feelings or attitudes, but would reflect societal norms and/or imply a general social

judgement based on the question content. Thus, the words 'acceptable/unacceptable' were selected, as they best fitted these criteria.

The questions were not asked in order of category to avoid item bias as subjects tend to answer questions that focus on the same construct in a similar manner (Anastasi, 1990)(See Appendices 2 & 3). The questions were ordered by means of stratified random sampling. Rosnow and Rosenthal (1996) cite this as an effective method of probability sampling and stress the importance of equal division of subclasses or strata so as to ensure proportional representation of each subclass.

The objective of these questionnaires was to determine the attitudes of psychology students to non-normative gender behaviours. (As noted earlier, cognisance was taken of the difference of the theoretical rating of an attitude as opposed to an actual response to the enactment of non-normative gendered behaviour). Respondents were asked for their age, gender, relationship status, home language, race and religion. These demographic details were included in order to ascertain whether or not they had significant relevance to the research. By way of example, respondents were asked to state their relationship status so that analysis could be done to find out whether being single, involved in a relationship, or married affects gender perceptions. A qualifier was included on the questionnaire informing the respondents that 'gender' and 'race' were required "to ensure a representative sample". It should be noted that respondents were not asked to provide their sexual orientation as it may have inhibited their responses and led them to assume

that the study was an assessment of sexual orientation. The second part of the questionnaires assessed the students' attitudes about gendered behaviours.

3.2.3 Behavioural Norms Questionnaires

The resulting questionnaires were labelled and introduced to participants as "behavioural norms' questionnaires. Two different 21-item self-report questionnaires were designed for this study to assess student attitudes to non-normative gendered behaviours (See Appendices 2 & 3). Each questionnaire was presented in the form of very short vignettes of a behaviour that was appropriate for one gender and not for the other. One questionnaire was designed to assess students' attitudes to non-normative gendered behaviours. A second, control questionnaire, was developed in which the genders were reversed in order to assess attitudes to gender-appropriate or normative behaviours. Thus, if the gender in the first questionnaire was male, then it was altered to read female in the control questionnaire. If the gender was female in the first questionnaire, in the control questionnaire it was changed to male. This was done in order to eliminate possible confounding variables. An example is the first vignette that asks about the appropriateness of physical fighting. The researcher wanted to ascertain whether fighting was inappropriate (or appropriate) because of the gender of the protagonists (appropriate for one gender and not the other), or whether the rating was based on violence being acceptable or unacceptable regardless of whether it is men or women fighting.

The questionnaires consisted of two sections. The first section comprised six questions and elicited socio-demographic details from the respondents. The second section consisted of twenty-one vignettes corresponding to the four categories used by McCarl-Nielsen et al (2000). The categories were made up as follows -

- Category 1 – Women’s Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour (behaviours that are not overtly sexual but may be considered sexually appealing by certain people)
- Category 2 - Women’s Explicitly Sexual Behaviour (behaviours that are overtly sexual)
- Category 3 - Men’s Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour (behaviours that are not overtly sexual but may be considered sexually appealing by certain people)
- Category 4 - Men’s Explicitly Sexual Behaviour (behaviours that are overtly sexual)

Table 1: Items selected from norm violation categories

| Category 1 | Category 2 | Category 3 | Category 4 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1: You see two women standing on Jamison Steps punching one another. (Vignette 1) | 7: A female student placed an advert with 'date-line.com' for a suitable male partner. (Vignette 4) | 12: Heather's boyfriend regularly buys Fairlady, Femina and Cosmopolitan. (Vignette 2) | 17: At Vanessa's braai, her brother was lying at the pool in a woman's bikini bottom. (Vignette 5) |
| 2: You're on a bus that is overcrowded. A man climbs on and looks for a seat. A woman gets up and offers her seat. (Vignette 3) | 8: At Billy's Bar, Jenny bought Mark a drink and then asked if he'd like to dance. (Vignette 14) | 13: One of the male lecturers was quietly knitting whilst overseeing exams. (Vignette 6) | 18: Thomas commented on how 'hot' Jonathan looked. (Vignette 8) |
| 3: There is a couple in your tutorial, whenever they enter or leave the lecture hall the woman always steps aside and opens the door for her boyfriend. (Vignette 7) | 9: Three women were sitting at a sidewalk café whistling and catcalling a number of men who walked past. (Vignette 16) | 14: Karen's father threw a Tupperware party and invited your mother. (Vignette 17) | 19: A man in your class bought flowers for another man. (Vignette 10) |
| 4: Melissa asked Kevin out on a date and paid for the evening. (Vignette 9) | 10: You work at the pharmacy on Saturday mornings and last week a woman came in and asked for condoms. (Vignette 18) | 15: One of the male lecturers regularly wears lipstick and mascara to class. (Vignette 19) | 20: Sarah's brother entered a male beauty pageant. (Vignette 12) |
| 5: You notice a woman sitting in the library with her legs wide open. (Vignette 11) | 11: A woman sitting on a barstool at a local pub pinched the barman's bum as he passed her. (Vignette 20) | 16: There was a man in a women's clothing shop trying on skirts. (Vignette 21) | 21: At the Smuts Formal you see two men dancing together. (Vignette 15) |
| 6: There is a woman in your Psych tutorial that has hairy legs and armpits. (Vignette 13) | | | |

3.3 SUBJECTS

Data was collected for the research in May 2003. The questionnaires were administered to first year psychology classes at the University of Cape Town (UCT) with the permission of the social psychology lecturer. It was a large class and was thus divided into two groups. The first group's lecture was at 9am and the second, at 12pm. The overlap between the two classes was not felt to be significant as students were not likely to have discussed the questionnaires, as they would probably have attended other lectures during the course of the morning.

At the start of each lecture, the lecturer introduced the researcher and advised the students that the lecture would be ending 10 minutes early to allow the researcher to hand out the questionnaires. He stressed the importance of research and encouraged the students to participate. The two questionnaires were randomly distributed to the students.

Approximately half of the sample group received the first questionnaire and the other half, received the control questionnaire. The sample was a convenience sample representing an age range that is particularly sensitive to conventional norms and behaviours. It was estimated that there were approximately 400 students. A total of 382 students took part in this study. Of these, 302 participants were female and 79 were male.

At the end of both lectures the researcher gave a brief overview of the study and presented it as an evaluation of 'behavioural' norms. Students were told that participation

was voluntary, and that they could elect to remain anonymous, or they could provide their names (without surnames) and contact telephone numbers in the space provided at the end of the questionnaire if they would be prepared to answer further questions if necessary.

3.4 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

Reliability refers to the consistency or stability of the research instrument. This can be measured by repetition of the questionnaire to a different population. If the results were found to be similar then the instrument would be considered to be reliable (Howell, 1992). The present research was a pilot study and thus the reliability of the instrument cannot be commented on. It was however based on a study conducted on a demographically similar population, the results of which provided the categories on which the current study was based.

The three necessary criteria for research evaluation are construct validity, internal validity and external validity (Anastasi, 1990). Broadly speaking, validity refers to whether a research instrument measures what it purports to measure (Howell, 1995). The term 'construct validity' is the measurement of an abstract concept or *construct* such as an attitude. Such constructs are defined theoretically in order to allow them to be measured. Construct validity is related to whether the study employs measures that reflect the underlying constructs (Tyson, 1991). In the present research, construct validity refers to whether the measure of attitudes to non-normative gendered behaviours actually measures

these attitudes. Hence the need for two questionnaires - an example of a violence question, is it about gender or aversion to violence. Internal validity is concerned with causal relationships between variables and external validity refers to the generalizability of the results (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 1996). This was taken into account when selecting a demographically similar population group to that used in the McCarl Nielsen et al (2000) study.

To ensure face validity and that the questionnaires were correctly phrased and in a way that would be relevant and understandable in a South African context, a pilot study was conducted. Two informal focus groups, each attended by three peer professionals, were set up to test the questionnaires. The duration of each focus group was approximately two hours.

Although the data on some of the questionnaires was incomplete, all but one, where the gender of the participant has been left out, were included.

3.5 METHODS OF ANALYSIS

The data was analysed using two different methods of statistical analyses. Initially, Factor Analysis (Child, 1970, Cureton & D'Agostino 1983, Stopher & Meyburg, 1979) was carried out on the data. Thereafter, the data was analysed using Analysis of Variance (Howell, 1995).

3.5.1. Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was initially carried out on the data using Maximum Likelihood Extractions. The factors were all analysed with rotated factors. The rationale behind this decision was to ascertain whether the factors would cluster in a similar arrangement to the categories laid out by McCarl-Nielsen et.al., namely, Women's Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour, Women's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour, Men's Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour, and Men's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour. This technique allows researchers to analyse complex relationships among numerous variables and search for meaningful clusters of variables (Stopher & Meyburg, 1979). According to Stopher & Meyburg, it is acceptable practice for researchers to make interpretations of the factors 'after the fact' instead of projecting or predicting factors prior to the analysis (1979). The factors did not group in the four categories identified by McCarl Nielsen et. al (2000) and could not be meaningfully interpreted. As Factor Analysis was an inadequate analytic tool it was discontinued.

3.5.2 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

The data was analysed using separate 2 (Gender: male/female) x 2 (Behaviour: atypical/control) Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). This is one of the most frequently used statistical techniques in psychological research (Howell, 1995). This technique allows the researcher to test for differences between sample means. Unlike, other tests, ANOVA does not restrict the number of means that can be tested. Thus, differences between two,

three, four, or any number of means can be ascertained. In addition, two or more independent variables can be dealt with simultaneously, determining not only the individual effect of each separate variable, but also the interacting effects of two or more of these variables (Howell, 1995).

This method of analysis is appropriate to analyse data involving two or more independent variables (gender and behaviour), and simultaneously allows a broad interpretation of the results whilst allowing meaningful analysis of each of the independent variables separately. It is also possible to ascertain relationships or interactions between the variables (Howell, 1992). In order to analyse data using ANOVA, the variables are required to be continuous, that is, variables which in theory can assume any value between the highest and lowest points on the scale. However, in practice, a variable is considered continuous when it can take on a number of different values (Howell, 1992).

3.6 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Respondents were advised that participation in this study was not compulsory, nor would it have any bearing on their course mark. In addition they were assured that the information would be treated confidentially. These measures were taken to ensure that the research procedures employed satisfied ethical research practices.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1 CHAPTER OUTLINE

This chapter presents the findings based on the statistical analysis of the questionnaire data. The chapter has been arranged into four sections. Part one is a descriptive account of the sample. Part two outlines the Factors Analysis that was carried out on the data. The third section examines the results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). In section four, the data has been summarised according to how both female respondents and male respondents rated the acceptability or unacceptability of behaviours for both women and for men.

4.2 PART ONE

4.2.1 Descriptive Data

A total number of 382 (n=382) participants took part in this study. One participant was excluded as his or her gender was unknown. The participants have been described demographically, including gender, age and race in the following tables:

Table 2: Gender

| Gender: | | |
|---------|-----|--------|
| Female | 302 | 79.06% |
| Male | 79 | 20.68% |

The Department of Psychology is gendered as evidenced by the female to male ratio. The Faculty of Humanities also has many more females (63.88%) enrolled than males (36.12%).

Table 3: Age

| Age: | Mean = 19.1 years | Std Dev = 2.42 |
|-------------|-------------------|----------------|
| 17-20 years | 337 | 89.15 % |
| 21-25 years | 33 | 8.73 % |
| 26-30 years | 4 | 1.06 % |
| 31-35 years | 1 | 0.26 % |
| 36-42 years | 1 | 0.26 % |
| Unknown | 6 | |

The results indicate that the majority of the respondents (89.15%) were relatively young; 17-20 years old.

Table 4: Race

| Race: | | |
|--------------------|-----|---------|
| White ¹ | 226 | 60.11 % |
| Black | 75 | 19.63 % |
| Coloured | 52 | 13.61 % |
| Indian | 16 | 4.19 % |
| Asian | 7 | 1.83 % |
| Unknown | 6 | |

A large percentage (60.11%), of the participants was white. This is a high percentage. The Faculty of the Humanities is predominantly white, but the overall percentage is lower with 53.75% of the students being white.

¹ I have used the terms White, Black and Coloured to distinguish 'racial' categories previously enforced by the State. Such usage does not indicate any acceptance of such categories. Broadly speaking, in a South African context, these racial categorisations are related to class and socio-economic status.

4.3 PART TWO

In this section an account of the findings using Factor Analysis has been provided in which the independent variables have been reformulated into a new set comprising fewer variables. Factor Analysis was carried out using Maximum Likelihood Extractions with Varimax rotation. The data was factor analysed to determine whether the data would group into the four categories identified in McCarl-Nielsen et al's (2002) study, namely Women's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour, Women's Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour, Men's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour and Men's Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour.

The Factor Analysis produced three factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 (See Table 4). Factor 1 explained 32.6% of the total variance, while Factor 2 and Factor 3 explained 5.9% and 5.2% of the total variance respectively. The cumulative percentage of variance explained by these three factors was 43.7%. The loadings of the items on the rotated factors are presented in Table 5. Loadings greater than or equal to 0.5 are taken as significant.

Table 5: Eigenvalues

| Value | Eigenvalues (newsread) Extraction: Maximum likelihood factors | | | |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | Eigenvalue | % Total variance | Cumulative Eigenvalue | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 6.836814 | 32.55626 | 6.836814 | 32.55626 |
| 2 | 1.240479 | 5.90704 | 8.077293 | 38.46330 |
| 3 | 1.097607 | 5.22670 | 9.174899 | 43.69000 |

Table 6 : Factor Loadings: Extraction - Maximum Likelihood

*Respondents were asked to rate the behaviours on a scale from 1-5, where
1= Completely Acceptable, 2= Acceptable, 3= Slightly Unacceptable, 4= Unacceptable,
5= Completely Unacceptable

| Vignette | Factor1 | Factor2 | Factor3 | Category |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. You see two women standing on Jamison Steps punching one another. Do you think their behaviour is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.166 | -0.124 | 0.288 | Women's unexplicitly sexual behaviour |
| 2. Heather's boyfriend regularly buys Fairlady, Femina and Cosmopolitan. Do you think this is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.522 | 0.164 | -0.013 | Men's explicitly sexual behaviour |
| 3. You're on a bus that is overcrowded. A man climbs on and looks for a seat. A woman gets up and offers her seat. Do you think this behaviour is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.221 | 0.482 | -0.062 | Women's unexplicitly sexual behaviour |
| 4. A female student placed an advert with 'date-line.com' for a suitable male partner. Do you think this is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.452 | 0.237 | 0.255 | Women's explicitly sexual behaviour |
| 5. At Vanessa's braai, her brother was lying at the pool in a woman's bikini bottom. Do you think this is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.639 | 0.013 | 0.225 | Men's explicitly sexual behaviour |
| 6. One of the male lecturers was quietly knitting whilst overseeing exams. Do you think this is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.422 | 0.180 | 0.178 | Men's unexplicitly sexual behaviour |
| 7. There is a couple in your tutorial, whenever they enter or leave the lecture hall the woman always steps aside and opens the door for her boyfriend. Do you think this behaviour is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.302 | 0.586 | 0.161 | Women's unexplicitly sexual behaviour |
| 8. Thomas commented on how 'hot' Jonathan looked. Do you think this is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.804 | 0.188 | -0.022 | Men's explicitly sexual behaviour |
| 9. Melissa asked Kevin out on a date and paid for the evening. Do you think this behaviour is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.206 | 0.806 | 0.074 | Women's unexplicitly sexual behaviour |
| 10. A man in your class bought flowers for another man. Do you think this is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.879 | 0.200 | -0.009 | Men's explicitly sexual behaviour |
| 11. You notice a woman sitting in the library with her legs wide open. Do you think this behaviour is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.377 | 0.187 | 0.393 | Women's unexplicitly sexual behaviour |
| 12. Saran's brother entered a male beauty pageant. Do you think this is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.472 | 0.233 | 0.117 | Men's explicitly sexual behaviour |
| 13. There is a woman in your tutorial that has hairy legs and armpits. Do you think this is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.427 | 0.201 | 0.151 | Women's unexplicitly sexual behaviour |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| 14. At Billy's Bar, Jenny bought Mark a drink and then asked if he'd like to dance. Do you think this is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.373 | 0.491 | 0.213 | Women's explicitly sexual behaviour |
| 15. At a residence Formal ball you see two Men dancing together. Do you think this is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.806 | 0.155 | 0.107 | Men's explicitly sexual behaviour |
| 16. Three women were sitting at a sidewalk café whistling and catcalling a number of Men who walked past. Do you think this is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.041 | 0.145 | 0.683 | Women's explicitly sexual behaviour |
| 17. Karen's father threw a Tupperware party and invited your mother. Do you think this is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.587 | 0.153 | 0.125 | Men's unexplicitly sexual behaviour |
| 18. You work at the pharmacy on Saturday mornings and last week a woman came in and asked for condoms. Do you think this is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.304 | 0.326 | 0.091 | Women's explicitly sexual behaviour |
| 19. One of the male lecturers regularly wears lipstick and mascara to class. Do you think this is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.711 | 0.145 | 0.107 | Men's unexplicitly sexual behaviour |
| 20. A woman sitting on a barstool at a local pub pinched the barman's bum as he passed her. Do you think her behaviour is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.106 | 0.057 | 0.712 | Women's explicitly sexual behaviour |
| 21. There was a man in a women's clothing shop trying on skirts. Do you think his behaviour is 1...2...3...4...5... | 0.764 | 0.133 | 0.215 | Men's unexplicitly sexual behaviour |
| Expl.Var | 5.577 | 2.024 | 1.573 | |
| Prp.Totl | 0.265 | 0.096 | 0.074 | |

Factor 1

The following eight items loaded on Factor 1:

| | | |
|-------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Vignette 2 | - | Men's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour |
| Vignette 5 | - | Men's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour |
| Vignette 8 | - | Men's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour |
| Vignette 10 | - | Men's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour |
| Vignette 15 | - | Men's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour |
| Vignette 17 | - | Men's Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour |
| Vignette 19 | - | Men's Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour |
| Vignette 21 | - | Men's Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour |

The above items were all examples of men's behaviour, but were a combination of explicitly sexual and unexplicitly sexual behaviour. All these items are examples of men engaging in behaviours that are not compatible with the traditional male role. The characters in these vignettes are partaking in typically feminine behaviours such as

reading women's magazines, noticing and commenting on the physical appearance of a fellow man and wearing clothing designed for women.

Factor 2

The following two items loaded on this factor:

- Vignette 7 - Women's Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour
- Vignette 9 - Women's Unexplicitly Sexual Behaviour

Both these items were from the category of women's unexplicitly sexual behaviour and depict women behaving in ways consistent with previously accepted male chivalrous behaviours.

Factor 3

Factor 3 consisted of the following two items:

- Vignette 16 - Women's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour
- Vignette 20 - Women's Explicitly Sexual Behaviour

Both of these items were from the category women's explicitly sexual behaviour. In addition both are examples of sexist male behaviours.

The factors in this study did not correspond with the four categories identified by MacCall-Nielsen et.al. (2000) and could thus not be meaningfully interpreted. In addition there were only two items loaded on factors 2 and 3 respectively, with only 12 of the 21 overall items being accounted for. It was therefore decided to analyse each item separately by means of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

4.4 PART THREE

The data was analysed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Separate 2 (gender: male / female) x 2 (behaviour: atypical / control) Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) was carried out on each item. The ANOVA results have been grouped in terms of the findings into six categories and are discussed below.

4.4.1 Category 1

The first category consisted of items in which participants agreed on either the atypical or control behaviour. An example is of the atypical behaviour of a man wearing a woman's swimming costume; both female and male participants agreed that this was inappropriate behaviour. Thus when the respondents agreed on the atypical behaviour, as in this example, they disagreed on the control behaviour. Female and male participants did not agree on the appropriateness or inappropriateness of a woman wearing a man's swimming costume. Female respondents rated this behaviour as more unacceptable than male respondents. If however, the participants disagreed on the atypical behaviour, then there was agreement on the control behaviour.

There were four such items on which female and male respondents disagreed on either the atypical or the control behaviour. Two of these items, vignettes 5 and 8 respectively, showed males being very critical of other males, and vignette 11 demonstrated women judging one another more harshly than men. These items are listed in Table 7.

Table 7:

Items in which female and male participants responded differently to the atypical and control vignettes

| Vignette | A ₁ : Female Respondents | | A ₂ : Male Respondents | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| | B ₁ : Atypical | B ₂ : Control | B ₁ : Atypical | B ₂ : Control |
| Vignette 5 Atypical: At Vanessa's braai, her brother was lying at the pool in a woman's bikini bottom Control: At Vanessa's braai, her sister was lying at the pool in a man's Speedo | 4.35 ¹ 1.49 ² 165 ³ | 4.32 ¹ 1.27 ² 135 ³ | 4.48 ¹ 1.54 ² 33 ³ | 3.63 ¹ 1.74 ² 46 ³ |
| $F_A = 0.138$ $F_B = 0.018$ $F_{AB}(1, 375) = 4.853$; $p = 0.028$ | | | | |
| Vignette 6 Atypical: One of the male lecturers was quietly knitting whilst overseeing exams Control: One of the female lecturers was quietly knitting whilst overseeing exams | 2.84 1.47 165 | 2.99 1.64 137 | 2.94 1.46 32 | 3.91 1.63 46 |
| $F_A = 0.010$ $F_B = 0.005$ $F_{AB}(1, 376) = 4.272$; $p = 0.039$ | | | | |
| Vignette 8 Atypical: Thomas commented on how 'hot' Jonathan looked Control: Claire commented on how 'hot' Laura looked | 2.81 1.56 165 | 2.33 1.31 136 | 3.47 1.74 32 | 2.11 1.30 46 |
| $F_A = 0.249$ $F_B = 0.000$ $F_{AB}(1, 375) = 5.454$; $p = 0.020$ | | | | |
| Vignette 11 Atypical: You notice a woman sitting in the library with her legs wide open Control: You notice a man sitting in the library with his legs wide open | 4.91 1.15 164 | 2.78 1.37 137 | 3.88 1.64 32 | 2.54 1.41 46 |
| $F_A = 0.000$ $F_B = 0.000$ $F_{AB}(1, 375) = 5.633$; $p = 0.018$ | | | | |

1 = Mean 2 = Std.Dev. 3 = N

The interaction effects on the 4 items listed in Table 7 were found to be significant.

Analysis of simple main effects was thus performed on each of these questions.

Vignette 5: [Wearing a swimming costume designed for the opposite sex]

Analysis of the simple effects indicates that female and male respondents did not differ in their rating of the acceptability of the gender inappropriate behaviour of a man wearing a woman's swimming costume ($F_{A \text{ at } B1}(1, 375) = 0.228$; $p = 0.632$). However, they did differ in their rating of the acceptability of the control behaviour, a woman wearing a swimming costume designed for the opposite sex ($F_{A \text{ at } B2}(1, 375) = 7.654$; $p = 0.006$),

which female respondents rated as significantly more unacceptable ($M = 4.32$) than male respondents ($M = 3.63$).

Women rated the wearing of a swimming costume designed for the opposite sex as equally unacceptable for females and males (Female: $M = 4.32$; Male: $M = 4.35$). ($F_{B \text{ at } A1} (1, 375) = 0.038$; $p = 0.845$). However, the male respondents rated a man wearing a woman's swimming costume as significantly more unacceptable ($M = 4.48$) than a woman wearing a man's swimming costume ($M = 3.63$). ($F_{B \text{ at } A2} (1, 375) = 6.609$; $p = 0.011$).

Vignette 6: [Knitting in public]

Analysis of the simple effects shows that females and males did not differ significantly in their rating of the acceptability of the gender inappropriate behaviour of a male lecturer knitting in a lecture hall ($F_{A \text{ at } B1} (1, 376) = 0.114$; $p = 0.736$). However their respective rating of the acceptability of the control behaviour, a female lecturer knitting in a lecture hall, did differ ($F_{A \text{ at } B2} (1, 376) = 12.297$; $p = 0.001$). Male respondents rated this behaviour as significantly more unacceptable ($M = 3.91$) than female respondents ($M = 2.99$), with the male mean score falling closer to the 'unacceptable' range, whereas the mean score of the female respondents fell below the midpoint on the 'acceptable' side of the scale, albeit only 'slightly acceptable'. Male respondents also rated a woman knitting in public as significantly more unacceptable ($M = 3.91$) than a man knitting publicly ($M = 2.94$). ($F_{B \text{ at } A2} (1, 376) = 7.452$; $p = 0.001$). Again, the mean score for a woman knitting

publicly was closer to the 'slightly unacceptable' side of the midpoint, than the mean score for a male knitting publicly which fell into the 'acceptable' range. Women rated knitting in a public place as equally acceptable for females and males. (Female: $M = 2.84$; Male: $M = 2.99$). ($F_{B \text{ at } A1} (1, 376) = 0.690$; $p = 0.410$).

Vignette 8: [Complimenting the appearance of a same-sexed person]

Simple effects analysis indicates that women and men differ significantly in their rating of the acceptability of the gender inappropriate behaviour of a man complimenting the appearance of another man ($F_{A \text{ at } B1} (1, 375) = 5.420$; $p = 0.020$). Male respondents rated this behaviour as significantly more unacceptable ($M = 3.47$) than female respondents ($M = 2.81$).

There was however, no significant difference in how female and male respondents rated the acceptability of the control behaviour, a woman complimenting another woman's appearance (Female: $M = 2.33$; Male: $M = 2.11$). ($F_{A \text{ at } B2} (1, 375) = 0.800$; $p = 0.373$). Both female and male participants rated this behaviour as 'acceptable'.

Women rated the behaviour of positively appraising the appearance of someone of the same sex as significantly less acceptable for a man ($M = 2.81$) than a woman ($M = 2.33$). ($F_{B \text{ at } A1} (1, 375) = 8.100$; $p = 0.005$). Male respondents also rated complimenting the appearance of a same-sexed person to be significantly more unacceptable for men ($M = 3.47$) than women ($M = 2.11$). ($F_{B \text{ at } A2} (1, 375) = 16.370$; $p = 0.000$). However, for both

females and males, the mean scores are below the midpoint making the behaviour 'acceptable'.

Vignette 11: [Sitting with legs apart]

Analysis of the simple effects shows that there is a significant difference in how women and men rate the acceptability of the gender inappropriate behaviour of a woman sitting with her legs apart ($F_{A \text{ at } B1} (1, 375) = 16.822; p = 0.000$). Female respondents rated this behaviour as significantly more unacceptable ($M = 4.91$) than male respondents ($M = 3.88$). Female and male participants did not differ in their rating of the acceptability of the control behaviour, a man sitting with his legs apart, which both genders considered acceptable (Female: $M = 2.78$; Male: $M = 2.54$). ($F_{A \text{ at } B2} (1, 375) = 1.129; p = 0.288$).

The behaviour of sitting with your legs apart was rated by female respondents as significantly more unacceptable for women ($M = 4.91$) than men ($M = 2.78$). ($F_{B \text{ at } A1} (1, 375) = 197.448; p = 0.000$). Male participants also rated the behaviour of sitting with your legs apart as significantly more unacceptable for women ($M = 3.88$) than men ($M = 2.54$). ($F_{B \text{ at } A2} (1, 375) = 19.448; p = 0.000$).

4.4.2 Category 2

The second category consisted of items in which the female and male participants disagreed on the appropriateness or inappropriateness of both the atypical and control

behaviours. Female and male respondents differed on whether behaviours were acceptable or unacceptable. There were only two such items. These items are listed in Table 8.

Table 8:
Items in which female and male participants responded differently to the appropriateness or inappropriateness of atypical and control behaviours

| Vignette | A ₁ : Female Respondents | | A ₂ : Male Respondents | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | B ₁ : Atypical | B ₂ : Control | B ₁ : Atypical | B ₂ : Control |
| Vignette 1 | 5.11 ¹ | 5.12 ¹ | 4.73 ¹ | 4.70 ¹ |
| Atypical: You see two women standing on Jamison Steps punching one another. | 1.05 ² | 1.00 ² | 1.13 ² | 1.23 ² |
| Control: You see two men standing on Jamison Steps punching one another. | 164 ³ | 137 ³ | 33 ³ | 46 ³ |
| $F_A = 0.003$ $F_B = 0.949$ $F_{AB}(1, 376) = 0.029$; $p = 0.866$ | | | | |
| Vignette 18 | 1.30 | 1.16 | 1.45 | 1.41 |
| Atypical: You work at the pharmacy on Saturday mornings and last week a woman came in and asked for condoms | 0.67 | 0.41 | 0.75 | 0.98 |
| Control: You work at the pharmacy on Saturday mornings and last week a man came in and asked for condoms | 164 | 137 | 33 | 46 |
| $F_A = 0.014$ $F_B = 0.276$ $F_{AB}(1, 376) = 0.344$; $p = 0.558$ | | | | |

1 = Mean 2 = Std.Dev. 3 = N

The items listed in Table 8 were found to have significant gender effects (F_A). Analysis of main effects was thus performed on each of these questions.

Vignette 1: [Physically fighting in public]

The ANOVA results revealed a significant difference in how female and male participants rated the behaviour of fighting physically with a person of the same sex. ($F_A(1, 376) = 8.930$; $p = 0.003$). Female respondents rated this behaviour as significantly more unacceptable ($M = 5.12$) than male respondents ($M = 4.71$) irrespective of the gender of those engaged in the fighting. The behaviour was equally unacceptable whether

committed by a female or male in the vignette (Female: $M = 5.05$; Male: $M = 5.02$). ($F_B(1, 376) = 0.004$; $p = 0.949$).

Vignette 18: [Buying condoms]

The ANOVA results showed a significant difference in how female and male participants rated the behaviour of buying condoms ($F_A = (1, 376) = 6.132$, $p = 0.014$). Female respondents rated the behaviour of buying condoms regardless of the sex of the person making the purchase, as significantly less acceptable ($M = 1.88$) than male participants ($M = 1.73$). For the control behaviour, of a man buying condoms, male respondents rated this as less acceptable ($M = 1.41$) than female respondents ($M = 1.16$) ($F_{A \text{ at } B2}(1, 376) = 5.285$; $p = 0.022$). The behaviour did however fall below the midpoint and was therefore 'acceptable'.

4.4.3 Category 3

The third category consisted of items in which both the female and male participants rated behaviours as appropriate or inappropriate depending on whether it was a woman or a man engaging in the behaviour. There was widespread agreement between female and male respondents on the gender appropriateness or inappropriateness of behaviours. These items are listed in Table 9.

Table 9:
Items in which female and male participants rated the behaviour differently
depending on the gender of the actor.

| Vignette | A ₁ : Female Respondents B ₁ : Atypical B ₂ : Control | | A ₂ : Male Respondents B ₁ : Atypical B ₂ : Control | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Vignette 2 Atypical: Heather's boyfriend regularly buys Fantasy, Femina & Cosmopolitan Control: Jim's girlfriend regularly buys Car Magazine & Men's Health | 2.52 ¹ 1.17 ² 165 ³ | 1.64 ¹ 0.82 ² 137 ³ | 2.55 ¹ 1.37 ² 33 ³ | 1.98 ¹ 1.22 ² 46 ³ |
| F _A = 0.194 F _B = 0.000 F _{AB} (1, 377) = 1.268; p = 0.261 | | | | |
| Vignette 3 Atypical: You're on a bus that is overcrowded. A man climbs on and looks for a seat. A woman gets up and offers her seat. Control: You're on a bus that is overcrowded. A woman climbs on and looks for a seat. A man gets up and offers his seat. | 2.67 ¹ 1.39 ² 164 ³ | 1.23 ¹ 0.66 ² 137 ³ | 3.03 ¹ 1.40 ² 33 ³ | 1.22 ¹ 0.51 ² 46 ³ |
| F _A = 0.211 F _B = 0.000 F _{AB} (1, 376) = 1.730; p = 0.189 | | | | |
| Vignette 7 Atypical: There is a couple in your tutorial, whenever they enter or leave the lecture hall, the woman always steps aside and opens the door for her boyfriend Control: There is a couple in your tutorial, whenever they enter or leave the lecture hall, the man always steps aside and opens the door for his girlfriend | 3.21 ¹ 1.50 ² 164 ³ | 1.25 ¹ 0.72 ² 137 ³ | 3.03 ¹ 1.51 ² 32 ³ | 1.39 ¹ 0.58 ² 46 ³ |
| F _A = 0.898 F _B = 0.000 F _{AB} (1, 375) = 1.147; p = 0.285 | | | | |
| Vignette 9 Atypical: Melissa asked Kevin out on a date and paid for the evening Control: Kevin asked Melissa out on a date & paid for the evening | 2.30 ¹ 1.38 ² 165 ³ | 1.64 ¹ 0.87 ² 137 ³ | 2.44 ¹ 1.56 ² 32 ³ | 1.83 ¹ 1.12 ² 46 ³ |
| F _A = 0.306 F _B = 0.000 F _{AB} (1, 376) = 0.025; p = 0.874 | | | | |
| Vignette 12 Atypical: Sarah's brother entered a male beauty pageant Control: Sarah's sister entered a female beauty pageant | 3.34 ¹ 1.58 ² 164 ³ | 1.55 ¹ 0.77 ² 137 ³ | 3.59 ¹ 1.60 ² 32 ³ | 1.33 ¹ 0.47 ² 46 ³ |
| F _A = 0.941 F _B = 0.000 F _{AB} (1, 375) = 2.266; p = 0.133 | | | | |
| Vignette 13 Atypical: There's a woman in your Psych tutorial that has hairy legs and armpits Control: There's a man in your Psych tutorial that has hairy legs and armpits | 3.34 ¹ 1.58 ² 164 ³ | 1.81 ¹ 1.20 ² 136 ³ | 3.59 ¹ 1.60 ² 32 ³ | 1.65 ¹ 0.97 ² 46 ³ |
| F _A = 0.790 F _B = 0.000 F _{AB} (1, 374) = 1.304; p = 0.254 | | | | |
| Vignette 15 Atypical: At a residence formal ball you see two men dancing together. Control: At a residence formal ball you see two women dancing together. | 2.87 ¹ 1.54 ² 165 ³ | 2.14 ¹ 1.15 ² 137 ³ | 3.21 ¹ 1.56 ² 33 ³ | 2.26 ¹ 1.20 ² 46 ³ |
| F _A = 0.184 F _B = 0.000 F _{AB} (1, 377) = 0.404; p = 0.526 | | | | |
| Vignette 21 Atypical: There was a man in a women's clothing store trying on skirts. Control: There was a woman in a man's clothing store trying on men's suits. | 3.88 ¹ 1.66 ² 164 ³ | 3.35 ¹ 1.41 ² 137 ³ | 4.15 ¹ 1.58 ² 33 ³ | 3.70 ¹ 1.50 ² 46 ³ |
| F _A = 0.138 F _B = 0.017 F _{AB} (1, 376) = 0.012; p = 0.914 | | | | |

1 = Mean 2 = Std.Dev. 3 = N

The effects of behaviour (F_B) were found to be significant for the items listed in Table 9. Analysis of main effects was thus performed on each of these questions.

Vignette 2: [Buying magazine targeted at opposite sex]

The ANOVA results indicated that female and male respondents rated the acceptability of buying a magazine targeted at the opposite sex as similarly appropriate. (Female: $M = 2.12$; Male: $M = 2.22$). ($F_A(1, 377) = 1.692$; $p = 0.194$). However, there was a significant difference whether it was a woman or a man buying the magazine targeted at the opposite sex. ($F_B(1, 377) = 27.283$; $p = 0.000$). Both female and male participants considered it significantly less acceptable for a man to buy women's magazines ($M = 2.53$) than for a woman to buy men's magazines ($M = 1.73$).

Vignette 3: [Offering seat to someone of the opposite sex]

The ANOVA results indicate that there was no difference between female and male respondents' rating of the behaviour of offering your seat to someone of the opposite sex. (Female: $M = 2.01$; Male: $M = 1.97$). ($F_A(1, 376) = 1.567$; $p = 0.211$). Both rated this as appropriate behaviour. However, there was a significant difference whether it was a woman offering her seat to a man in the vignette or a man offering his seat to a woman. ($F_B(1, 376) = 135.178$; $p = 0.000$). Both female and male participants rated the gender inappropriate behaviour of a woman offering her seat to a man as significantly less acceptable ($M = 2.73$) than a man offering his seat to a woman ($M = 1.22$).

Vignette 7: [Opening the door for someone of the opposite sex]

The ANOVA results show that both female and male respondents similarly rated the behaviour of stepping aside and opening the door for a person of the opposite sex as acceptable behaviour. (Female: $M = 2.32$; Male $M = 2.06$). ($F_A(1, 375) = 0.017$; $p = 0.898$).

However, there was a significant difference whether a woman stepped aside and opened the door for a man, or whether a man was the protagonist in the vignette. ($F_B(1, 375) = 140.915$; $p = 0.000$). Both female and male respondents rated the gender inappropriate behaviour of a woman stepping aside and opening the door for a man as significantly less acceptable ($M = 3.18$) than a man behaving similarly ($M = 1.28$).

Vignette 9: [Asking a person of the opposite sex out on a date]

The ANOVA results show that there was no difference in how female and male respondents rated the acceptability of the behaviour of asking a person of the opposite sex out on a date. (Female: $M = 2.00$; Male: $M = 2.08$). ($F_A(1, 376) = 1.050$; $p = 0.306$).

However, there was a significant difference whether the behaviour of asking someone of the opposite sex out on a date was carried out by a woman or by a man. ($F_B(1, 376) = 16.771$; $p = 0.000$). Females and males agreed that the gender inappropriate behaviour of

a woman asking a man out on a date was significantly less acceptable ($M = 2.32$) than a man asking a woman out on a date ($M = 1.69$).

Vignette 12: [Entering a beauty pageant]

The ANOVA results showed that female and male participants rated the acceptability of entering a beauty pageant similarly. (Female: $M = 2.53$; Male: $M = 2.26$). ($F_A(1, 375) = 0.006$; $p = 0.941$). There was, however, a significant difference whether the vignette was about a man entering a male beauty pageant or about a woman entering a female beauty pageant. ($F_B(1, 375) = 161.054$; $p = 0.000$). Female and male respondents agreed that the behaviour of a man entering a male beauty pageant was significantly less acceptable ($M = 3.38$) than a woman entering a female beauty pageant ($M = 1.50$).

Vignette 13: [Hairy legs and armpits]

The ANOVA results indicate that female and male respondents rated the acceptability of a person displaying hairy legs and armpits similarly. (Female: $M = 2.65$; Male: $M = 2.45$). ($F_A(1, 374) = 0.071$; $p = 0.790$). There was, however, a significant difference whether the person who displayed hairy legs and armpits was a woman or a man. ($F_B(1, 374) = 94.099$; $p = 0.000$). Both female and male respondents rated the gender inappropriate behaviour of a woman displaying hairy legs and armpits as significantly less acceptable ($M = 3.38$) than a man ($M = 1.77$).

Vignette 15: [Dancing with someone of the same sex]

The ANOVA results showed that female and male participants rated the acceptability of two people of the same sex dancing together as similarly appropriate. (Female: $M = 2.54$; Male: $M = 2.66$). ($F_A(1, 377) = 1.771$; $p = 0.184$). There was, however, a significant difference whether the couple dancing together was a male or female couple ($F_B(1, 377) = 22.835$; $p = 0.000$). Female and male respondents both rated the behaviour of two men dancing together as significantly less acceptable ($M = 2.92$) than two women behaving similarly ($M = 2.17$).

Vignette 21: [Trying on clothing designed for opposite sex]

The ANOVA showed no significant difference in how female and male participants rate the acceptability of the behaviour of trying on clothing designed for the opposite sex ($F_A(1, 376) = 2.210$; $p = 0.138$). However, the behaviour of trying on clothing designed for the opposite sex was significantly more unacceptable when committed by a man in the vignette ($M = 3.92$) than a woman ($M = 3.46$). ($F_B(1, 376) = 5.790$; $p = 0.017$).

4.1.1 Category 4

The fourth category consisted of items in which there was a significant difference between female and male participants as well as a significant difference in the rating of the appropriateness or inappropriateness of atypical and control behaviours. In these five

items female and male respondents did not feel similarly about the degree of appropriateness of inappropriateness of behaviours. They did, however, agree that the level of acceptability/unacceptability of these behaviours was dependant on the gender of the person engaged in the behaviour. These items are listed in Table 10.

Table 10:
Items in which there was a significant difference between the genders and a significant difference in responses to the behaviours

| Vignette | A ₁ : Female Respondents | | A ₂ : Male Respondents | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| | B ₁ : Atypical | B ₂ : Control | B ₁ : Atypical | B ₂ : Control |
| Vignette 10: Atypical: A man in your class bought flowers for another man Control: A woman in your class bought flowers for another woman | 3.07 ¹ 1.66 ² 164 ³ | 1.82 ¹ 0.94 ² 137 ³ | 3.47 ¹ 1.67 ² 32 ³ | 2.43 ¹ 1.34 ² 46 ³ |
| $F_A = 0.005$ $F_B = 0.000$ $F_{AB} (1, 375) = 0.377; p = 0.540$ | | | | |
| Vignette 16 Atypical: Three women were sitting at a sidewalk café whistling and catcalling a number of men who walked past. Control: Three men were sitting at a sidewalk café whistling and catcalling a number of women who walked past. | 3.73 1.54 164 | 4.85 1.27 137 | 3.18 1.49 33 | 3.91 1.50 46 |
| $F_A = 0.000$ $F_B = 0.000$ $F_{AB} (1, 376) = 1.136; p = 0.287$ | | | | |
| Vignette 17 Atypical: Karen's father threw a Tupperware party and invited your mother Control: Karen's mother threw a Tupperware party and invited your mother | 2.63 1.39 164 | 1.41 0.80 136 | 3.12 1.54 33 | 1.74 0.95 46 |
| $F_A = 0.007$ $F_B = 0.000$ $F_{AB} (1, 375) = 0.281; p = 0.596$ | | | | |
| Vignette 19 Atypical: One of the male lecturers regularly wears lipstick and mascara to class Control: One of the female lecturers regularly wears lipstick and mascara to class | 4.23 1.53 164 | 1.15 0.35 137 | 4.36 1.58 33 | 1.72 1.05 46 |
| $F_A = 0.021$ $F_B = 0.000$ $F_{AB} (1, 376) = 2.113; p = 0.147$ | | | | |
| Vignette 20 Atypical: A woman sitting on a barstool at a local pub pinched the barman's bum as he passed her Control: A man sitting on a barstool at a local pub pinched the barlady's bum as she passed him | 3.72 1.56 164 | 5.33 0.96 137 | 3.45 1.44 33 | 4.74 1.39 46 |
| $F_A = 0.013$ $F_B = 0.000$ $F_{AB} (1, 376) = 0.891; p = 0.346$ | | | | |

1 = Mean 2 = Std.Dev. 3 = N

Vignette 10: [Buying flowers for person of the same sex]

The ANOVA results showed that there was a significant difference in how female and male participants rated the behaviour of a buying flowers for a person of the same sex ($F_B(1, 375) = 40.190; p = 0.000$). Both female and male respondents rated the behaviour of a buying flowers for a member of the same sex as less acceptable for a man ($M = 3.14$) than for a woman ($M = 1.97$). There was also a significant difference in how female and male respondents rated the acceptability of buying flowers for a person of the same sex. ($F_A(1, 375) = 7.865; p = 0.005$). Male respondents rated this behaviour as significantly less acceptable ($M = 2.86$) than female respondents ($M = 2.50$) irrespective of the gender of the person engaged in the behaviour. However, this behaviour did fall below the midpoint and was therefore considered 'acceptable'.

Vignette 16: [Catcalling]

The ANOVA results indicated that there was a significant difference in the rating of catcalling as a function of the gender of the person engaged in catcalling ($F_B(1, 376) = 25.637; p = 0.000$). Female and male respondents agreed that it was significantly less acceptable for a man to catcall a woman ($M = 4.61$) than for a woman to catcall a man ($M = 3.63$). However, there was also a significant difference in how female and male participants rated the acceptability of catcalling a person of the opposite sex. ($F_A(1, 376) = 16.310; p = 0.000$). Female respondents rated the behaviour of catcalling a member of

the opposite sex, as significantly more unacceptable ($M = 4.24$) than male respondents ($M = 3.61$) irrespective of whether it was a male or female actor performing the behaviour.

Vignette 17: [Tupperware party]

The ANOVA results indicated that there was a significant difference in the ratings as a function of the gender of the person throwing the Tupperware party ($F_B(1, 375) = 74.782; p = 0.000$). Both female and male respondents rated it significantly less acceptable for a man to throw a Tupperware party ($M = 2.72$) than for a woman to do the same ($M = 1.49$). However, there was a significant difference in female and male participants rating of the acceptability of throwing a Tupperware party and inviting a member of the opposite sex to attend. ($F_A(1, 375) = 7.313; p = 0.007$). Irrespective of the gender of the actor, males rated the behaviour of throwing a Tupperware party as significantly less acceptable ($M = 2.32$) than female respondents ($M = 2.08$). Nonetheless, it should be noted that the mean scores fell below the midpoint which indicated that the behaviour fell in the 'acceptable' range.

Vignette 19: [Wearing mascara and lipstick]

The ANOVA results indicated that there was a significant difference between how female and male participants rated the acceptability of the behaviour of a man wearing mascara and lipstick. ($F_A(1, 376) = 5.412; p = 0.021$). Male respondents rated this behaviour as less acceptable ($M = 1.72$) than female respondents ($M = 1.15$). However, the behaviour

was still in the 'acceptable' range. There was also a significant difference whether the gender of the person wearing the mascara and lipstick was male or female ($F_B(1, 376) = 359.420$; $p = 0.000$). Both female and male respondents rated it significantly less acceptable for a man to wear mascara and lipstick ($M = 4.25$) than for a woman ($M = 1.29$).

Vignette 20: [Pinching the bum of someone of the opposite sex]

There was a significant difference in the ratings when it was a woman who pinched a man's bum compared to when it was a man doing the pinching. ($F_B(1, 376) = 70.916$; $p = 0.000$). It was rated as significantly less acceptable for a man to pinch a woman's bum ($M = 5.18$) than for a woman to pinch a man's bum ($M = 3.68$). This was true of the ratings of both female and male participants. However, there was a discrepancy in how female and male respondents rated the acceptability of pinching the bum of a member of the opposite sex. ($F_A(1, 376) = 6.182$; $p = 0.013$). Irrespective of the gender of the actor, female respondents rated this behaviour as significantly more unacceptable ($M = 4.45$) than male respondents ($M = 4.20$).

4.4.5 Category 5

The fifth category consisted of items in which there were no significant effects. In these items female and male participants agreed that these behaviours were equally acceptable for both genders. These items are listed in Table 11.

Table 11:
Items in which female and male participants did not differ in their ratings

| Vignette | A ₁ : Female Respondents | | A ₂ : Male Respondents | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | B ₁ : Atypical | B ₂ : Control | B ₁ : Atypical | B ₂ : Control |
| Vignette 4 | 2.66 ¹ | 2.59 ¹ | 2.58 ¹ | 2.87 ¹ |
| Atypical: A female student placed an advert with 'date-line.com' for a suitable male partner | 1.29 ² | 1.09 ² | 1.23 ² | 1.36 ² |
| Control: A male student placed an advert with 'date-line.com' for a suitable female partner | 164 ³ | 136 ³ | 33 ³ | 46 ³ |
| $F_A = 0.527 \quad F_B = 0.476 \quad F_{AB} (1, 375) = 1.348; p = 0.246$ | | | | |
| Vignette 14 | 1.85 | 1.56 | 1.75 | 1.70 |
| Atypical: At Billy's Bar, Jenny bought Mark a drink and asked if he'd like to dance | 1.06 | 0.72 | 0.88 | 1.01 |
| Control: At Billy's Bar, Mark bought Jenny a drink and asked if she'd like to dance | 164 | 137 | 32 | 46 |
| $F_A = 0.901 \quad F_B = 0.149 \quad F_{AB} (1, 375) = 0.982; p = 0.322$ | | | | |

1 = Mean 2 = Std.Dev. 3 = N

Vignette 4: [Advertising on-line for a date]

The ANOVA results indicated that there was no significant difference in how female and male respondents rated the acceptability of advertising on-line for a partner of the opposite sex. (Female: $M = 2.63$; Male: $M = 2.75$). ($F_A (1, 375) = 0.401; p = 0.527$).

There was also no significant difference, or interaction effects whether it was a woman or a man advertising for a partner of the opposite sex. (Female: $M = 2.64$; Male: $M = 2.66$). ($F_B (1, 375) = 0.508; p = 0.476$).

Vignette 14: [Buying a drink for a person of the opposite sex]

The ANOVA results indicated that there was no significant difference in how female and male respondents rated the acceptability of buying a drink and asking a member of the opposite sex to dance. (Female: $M = 1.72$; Male: $M = 1.72$). ($F_A (1, 375) = 0.016; p =$

0.901). There was also no significant difference whether it was a woman or a man buying the drink and asking a person of the opposite sex to dance. (Atypical female behaviour: $M = 0.80$; Control male behaviour: $M = 1.60$). ($F_B(1, 375) = 2.087$; $p = 0.149$). However, female respondents rated the behaviour of buying a drink for someone of the opposite sex and then asking them to dance, as less acceptable for a woman ($M = 1.85$) than for a man ($M = 1.56$). ($F_{B \text{ at } A1}(1, 375) = 7.348$; $p = 0.007$).

4.4.6 Category 6

The behaviours have also been divided into two tables containing the five most gender inappropriate behaviours as rated by female and male respondents. These behaviours are listed below in Tables 12 and 13 respectively.

Table 12:
Items which *female* participants rated as most inappropriate

| Vignette | A ₁ : Female Respondents | | A ₂ : Male Respondents | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | B ₁ : Atypical | B ₂ : Control | B ₁ : Atypical | B ₂ : Control |
| Vignette 20 | 3.72 ¹ | 5.33 ¹ | 3.45 ¹ | 4.74 ¹ |
| Control: A man sitting on a barstool at a local pub pinched the barlady's bum as she passed him | 1.56 ² | 0.96 ² | 1.44 ² | 1.39 ² |
| | 164 ³ | 137 ³ | 33 ³ | 46 ³ |
| $F_{AB}(1, 376) = 0.891$; $p = 0.346$ $F_A = 0.013$ $F_B = 0.000$ | | | | |
| Vignette 1 | 5.11 | 5.12 | 4.73 | 4.70 |
| Atypical: You see two women standing on Jamison Steps punching one another. | 1.05 | 1.00 | 1.13 | 1.23 |
| Control: You see two men standing on Jamison Steps punching one another. | 164 | 137 | 33 | 46 |
| $F_{AB}(1, 376) = 0.029$; $p = 0.866$ $F_A = 0.003$ $F_B = 0.949$ | | | | |
| Vignette 11 | 4.91 | 2.78 | 3.88 | 2.54 |
| Atypical: You notice a woman sitting in the library with her legs wide open. | 1.15 | 1.37 | 1.64 | 1.41 |
| | 164 | 137 | 32 | 46 |
| $F_{AB}(1,375) = 5.633$; $p = 0.018$ $F_A = 0.000$ $F_B = 0.000$ | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Vignette 5 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.48 | 3.63 |
| Atypical: At Vanessa's braai, her brother was lying at the pool in a woman's bikini bottom | 1.49 | 1.27 | 1.54 | 1.74 |
| | 165 | 135 | 33 | 46 |
| Control: At Vanessa's braai her sister was lying at the pool in a man's speedo | | | | |
| $F_{AB}(1, 375) = 4.853; p = 0.028 \quad F_A = 0.138 \quad F_B = 0.018$ | | | | |
| Vignette 19 | 4.23 | 1.15 | 4.36 | 1.72 |
| Atypical: One of the male lecturers regularly wears lipstick and mascara to class. | 1.53 | 0.35 | 1.58 | 1.05 |
| | 164 | 137 | 33 | 46 |
| $F_{AB}(1, 376) = 2.113; p = 0.147 \quad F_A = 0.021 \quad F_B = 0.000$ | | | | |
| 1 = Mean 2 = Std.Dev. 3 = N | | | | |

Table 13:
Items which *male* participants rated as most inappropriate

| Vignette | A ₁ : Female Respondents | | A ₂ : Male Respondents | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | B ₁ : Atypical | B ₂ : Control | B ₁ : Atypical | B ₂ : Control |
| Vignette 20 | 3.72 | 5.33 | 3.45 | 4.74 |
| Control: A man sitting on a barstool at a local pub pinched the carady's bum as she passed him | 1.56 | 0.96 | 1.44 | 1.39 |
| | 164 | 137 | 33 | 46 |
| $F_{AB}(1, 376) = 0.891; p = 0.346 \quad F_A = 0.013 \quad F_B = 0.000$ | | | | |
| Vignette 1 | 5.11 | 5.12 | 4.73 | 4.70 |
| Atypical: You see two women standing on Jamison Steps punching one another. | 1.05 | 1.00 | 1.13 | 1.23 |
| Control: You see two men standing on Jamison Steps punching one another. | 164 | 137 | 33 | 46 |
| $F_{AB}(1, 376) = 0.029; p = 0.866 \quad F_A = 0.003 \quad F_B = 0.949$ | | | | |
| Vignette 5 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.48 | 3.63 |
| Atypical: At Vanessa's braai, her brother was lying at the pool in a woman's bikini bottom. | 1.49 | 1.27 | 1.54 | 1.74 |
| | 165 | 135 | 33 | 46 |
| $F_{AB}(1, 375) = 4.853; p = 0.028 \quad F_A = 0.138 \quad F_B = 0.018$ | | | | |
| Vignette 19 | 4.23 | 1.15 | 4.36 | 1.72 |
| Atypical: One of the male lecturers regularly wears lipstick and mascara to class. | 1.53 | 0.35 | 1.58 | 1.05 |
| | 164 | 137 | 33 | 46 |
| $F_{AB}(1, 376) = 2.113; p = 0.147 \quad F_A = 0.021 \quad F_B = 0.000$ | | | | |
| Vignette 21 | 3.88 | 3.38 | 4.15 | 3.70 |
| Atypical: There was a man in a women's clothing shop trying on skirts. | 1.66 | 1.41 | 1.58 | 1.50 |
| | 164 | 137 | 33 | 46 |
| $F_{AB}(1, 376) = 0.012; p = 0.914 \quad F_A = 0.013 \quad F_B = 0.017$ | | | | |
| 1 = Mean 2 = Std.Dev. 3 = N | | | | |

4.5 PART FOUR

The items have been arranged according to how female and male respondents rated the acceptability or unacceptability of behaviours for both women and men. The mean scores

were used with scores ranging from 1 - 3 being ‘acceptable’ and scores from 4-6 being ‘unacceptable’.

The following table (14) consists of behaviours that women and men rated as unacceptable for members of their own gender, but not for members of the opposite gender.

Table 14: Behaviours which women and men rated as unacceptable for members of their own gender, but acceptable for members of the opposite gender

| Women Respondents: | Male Respondents: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Behaviours that were unacceptable only for women: | Behaviours that were unacceptable only for men: |
| Vignette 11 You notice a woman sitting in the library with her legs wide open. Unacceptable for women (M = 4.91) Slightly acceptable for men (M = 2.78) | Vignette 12 Sarah's brother entered a male beauty pageant. Slightly unacceptable for men (M = 3.59) Completely acceptable for women (M = 1.33) Vignette 16 Three men were sitting at a sidewalk café & catcalling a number of women who walked past. Slightly unacceptable for men (M = 3.91) Slightly acceptable for women (M = 3.18) Vignette 19 One of the male lecturers regularly wears lipstick and mascara to class. Slightly unacceptable for men (M = 4.36) Acceptable for women (M = 1.72) Vignette 20 A man sitting on a barstool at a local pub pinched the barlady's bum as she passed him. Unacceptable for men (M = 4.74) Slightly acceptable for women (M = 3.45) |

Out of the twenty-one behaviours presented in the vignettes, male respondents rated four behaviours as unacceptable for men (Table 14), but the same behaviours did not fall within the range of unacceptable behaviours when performed by women.

Two of these behaviours, men catcalling women and men pinching women’s bums (vignette 16 and 20 respectively), are examples of behaviours which are widely

understood to be unacceptable in this sample. The remaining two behaviours, namely a man entering a male beauty pageant, and that of a man regularly wearing lipstick and mascara (vignettes 12 and 19 respectively), are behaviours that are considered acceptable conduct for women but not for men.

In contrast, female participants only rated one behaviour as unacceptable when performed by women, but not when performed by men.

The following table consists of behaviours that women and men rated as less acceptable for members of their own gender, than for members of the opposite gender.

Table 15: behaviours that women rated as less acceptable for women and men rated as less acceptable for men

| Women Respondents: | Male Respondents: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Behaviours that were less acceptable for women than for men: | Behaviours that were less acceptable for men than for women: |
| Vignette 3 You're on a bus that is overcrowded. A man climbs on and looks for a seat. A woman gets up and offers her seat. Slightly acceptable for women (M = 2.67) Completely acceptable for men (M = 1.23) | Vignette 2 Heather's boyfriend regularly buys Fairlady, Femina & Cosmopolitan Slightly acceptable for men (M = 2.55) Acceptable for women (M = 1.98) |
| Vignette 7 There is a couple in your tutorial, whenever they enter or leave the lecture hall, the women steps aside and opens the door for her boyfriend. Slightly acceptable for women (M = 3.21) Completely acceptable for men (M = 1.25) | Vignette 8 Thomas commented on how 'hot' Jonathan looked Slightly acceptable for men (M = 3.47) Acceptable for women (M = 2.11) |
| Vignette 13 There is a woman in your Psych tutorial that has hairy legs and armpits. Slightly acceptable for women (M = 3.34) Acceptable for men (M = 1.81) | Vignette 10 A man in your class bought flowers for another man Slightly acceptable for men (M = 3.47) Acceptable for women (M = 2.43) |
| | Vignette 15 At a residence formal ball you see two men dancing together Slightly acceptable for men (M = 3.21) Acceptable for women (M = 2.26) |
| | Vignette 17 Karen's father threw a Tupperware party and invited your mother Slightly acceptable for men (M = 3.12) Acceptable for women (M = 1.74) |

It can be seen from Table 15 that male respondents rated five behaviours as more acceptable for women than for men, whilst there were only three behaviours that female respondents deemed more acceptable for men than for women.

Table 16 includes behaviours that women and men rated as acceptable for members of their own gender, but unacceptable for members of the opposite gender.

Table 16: behaviours that women and men only found acceptable for members of their own genders

| Women Respondents: | Male Respondents: |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Behaviours that were acceptable for women but unacceptable for men: | Behaviours that were acceptable for men but unacceptable for women: |
| Vignette 19 One of the male lecturers regularly wears lipstick and mascara to class. Completely acceptable for women (<i>M</i> = 1.15) Slightly unacceptable for men (<i>M</i> = 4.23) | Vignette 6 One of the female lecturers was quietly knitting whilst overseeing exams Slightly acceptable for men (<i>M</i> = 2.94) Slightly unacceptable for women (<i>M</i> = 3.91) |
| Vignette 21 There was a man in a woman's clothing shop trying on skirts Slightly acceptable for women (<i>M</i> = 3.38) Slightly unacceptable for men (<i>M</i> = 3.88) | Vignette 11 You notice a woman sitting in the library with her legs wide open. Slightly acceptable for men (<i>M</i> = 2.54) Slightly unacceptable for women (<i>M</i> = 3.88) |
| | Vignette 13 There is a woman in your Psych tutorial that has hairy legs and armpits. Acceptable for men (<i>M</i> = 1.65) Slightly unacceptable for women (<i>M</i> = 3.59) |

From the results shown in Table 16, it is evident that male respondents find it acceptable for a man to sit with his legs apart. However, they considered it unacceptable for a woman to sit in a similar position (vignette 11). They also rated it unacceptable for a woman not to remove body hair, or to knit in public, but did not find body hair or knitting in public unacceptable for men (vignettes 16 & 3).

Women respondents were opposed to men regularly wearing lipstick and mascara as well as men who experiment with women’s clothing (vignettes 19 and 21). However, these same behaviours are acceptable when performed by women.

The following table consists of behaviours that women and men rated as less acceptable for members of their own gender than for members of the opposite gender.

Table 17: behaviours that women and men found more acceptable when performed by members of the opposite gender

| Women Respondents: | Male Respondents: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Behaviours that were less acceptable for men than for women: | Behaviours that were less acceptable for women than for men: |
| Vignette 2 Heather’s boyfriend regularly buys Fairlady, Femina & Cosmopolitan Acceptable for women (M = 1.64) Slightly acceptable for men (M = 2.52) | Vignette 3 You’re on a bus that is overcrowded. A man climbs on and looks for a seat. A woman gets up and offers her seat. Completely acceptable for men (M = 1.22) Slightly acceptable for women (M = 3.03) |
| Vignette 8 Thomas commented on how ‘hot’ Jonathan looked Acceptable for women (M = 2.33) Slightly acceptable for men (M = 2.81) | Vignette 7 There is a couple in your tutorial, whenever they enter or leave the lecture hall, the women steps aside and opens the door for her boyfriend. Completely acceptable for men (M = 1.39) Slightly acceptable for women (M = 3.03) |
| Vignette 10 A man in your class bought flowers for another man Acceptable for women (M = 1.82) Slightly acceptable for men (M = 3.07) | |
| Vignette 12 Sarah’s brother entered a male beauty pageant Acceptable for women (M = 1.55) Slightly acceptable for men (M = 3.34) | |
| Vignette 15 At a residence formal ball you see two men dancing together Acceptable for women (M = 2.14) Slightly acceptable for men (M = 2.87) | |
| Vignette 17 Karen’s father threw a Tupperware party and invited your mother Completely acceptable for women (M = 1.41) Slightly acceptable for men (M = 2.63) | |

Table 17 illustrates that there were six behaviours female respondents found less acceptable for men to perform than women. They found that for a man to read a woman’s

magazine, positively appraise the appearance of another man, buy flowers or dance with a man, enter a beauty pageant or throw a Tupperware party (vignettes 2, 8, 10, 15, 12 and 17 respectively), was slightly less acceptable for men.

However, there were only two behaviours that male participants deemed less acceptable for women to perform. Men were not opposed to women engaging giving up their seats or opening doors for men, but rated this behaviour as less acceptable when performed by women than if they were to be performed by men (vignettes 3 and 7).

4.6 CONCLUSION:

Based on the results outlined in this chapter, a detailed discussion of the findings is presented in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The results indicate that longstanding, traditional notions of appropriate and inappropriate gendered behaviours are entrenched as normative. However, there appears to be a measure of tolerance and flexibility in these attitudes with numerous behaviours being rated as acceptable or unacceptable, but only marginally so. The results also show that attitudes regarding the gender appropriateness or inappropriateness of specific behaviours is often sanctioned or censored by both women and men. The findings in this study reflect similar findings to previous work in this area.

5.2 THE SAMPLE

As the population used for this study consists of first year students from UCT certain historical and cultural factors need to be taken into account. Historically UCT is a white, English speaking university. Given South Africa's Apartheid history and the economic divide created by this regime between black and white, we can assume that the majority of students are relatively privileged and are predominantly from middle-class backgrounds. The fact that this group is privileged and educated plays a significant role not only in the process of 'becoming gendered', but also impacts on access to information and formation of attitudes. Class and culture inform the gendered experience (Mama, 1997 & Imam1997). UCT positions itself as a liberal university committed to becoming

more representative/inclusive of South Africa as a whole. Even so, its student body is currently still comprised of a white majority and is still in essence a white university. This is reflected in the cultural climate at the university. In this atmosphere it is likely there is an understanding among black students that they are entering an environment dominated by white, English speaking, middle-class culture. The prevailing attitudes of this group are likely to be frequently upheld as embodying 'the norm' on campus. It may be speculated that those who do not fall within this category may well aspire to attitudes and behaviours modelled by this group. This influence may have minimised possible differences in attitudes between the race groups.

Another salient feature of the sample is that it is comprised of two-thirds women. This is no coincidence. Psychology as a profession is in itself gendered and this is evidenced by the female/male ratio of the students. It is a nurturing, care-giving profession - the type of profession that girls are socialised into (Goffman, 1977) Girls are groomed to help and understand others and would "naturally" be drawn to professions under the Humanities umbrella. Boys' interests, by contrast, are channelled towards the sciences and business related fields (Eagly & Wood, 1991). This is because boys by "nature" are rational, independent thinkers who seek out challenge and adventure (Goffman, 1977 & Grabrucker, 1988). In addition, boys, as the future providers/breadwinners, would be inclined towards careers with economic potential (Eagly, Wood & Diekman, 2000). Furthermore, the faculty of Humanities is colloquially considered to be a faculty of the 'liberal arts', thus the students are perceived to be tolerant and accepting. By contrast, the

faculties of science, business and medicine are considered to be less 'liberal' and the students, more 'conservative' in their attitudes.

It should be noted that demographically, the subjects are not representative of the University of Cape Town (UCT), nor of the Western Cape population. Although predominantly white, the overall ratio of white students at UCT is not as marked as in this sample. By contrast, the population of the Western Cape is largely coloured. Thus, given the specific demographic make-up of this sample group, the results from this study could not be readily generalised to either UCT or the larger Western Cape.

It is worth noting that respondents were deliberately not asked about their sexual orientation as much of the literature indicates that heterosexual men can easily feel threatened when their sexuality is called into question (Bem 1981, Deaux & Major, 1987, Kimmel & Messner, 1992, Whitehead, 2001). Were respondents questioned about their sexual orientation, they may have interpreted this study as a study to determine sexual orientation and may have overcompensated or been less open in their responses.

Given the above factors, the results may be interpreted as specific to the culture and values of this particular sample. Within this context the following discussion outlines the attitudes that emerged. These have been grouped according to statistical similarities presented in the results section.

5.3 Category 1: Male - female disagreement on either atypical or control behaviours

In the four vignettes that make up this category, female and male respondents disagreed on the acceptability of either the atypical or control behaviours. It is clear that no single mechanism accounts for an attitude, rather the reasons are multi-layered and interconnected. Possible explanations for these attitudes are explored in more depth.

| |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><u>Vignette 5</u> Atypical: At Vanessa's braai, her brother was lying at the pool in a woman's bikini bottom Control: At Vanessa's braai, her sister was lying at the pool in a man's <i>Speedo</i></p> <p><u>Vignette 6</u> Atypical: One of the male lecturers was quietly knitting whilst overseeing exams Control: One of the female lecturers was quietly knitting whilst overseeing exams</p> <p><u>Vignette 8</u> Atypical: Thomas commented on how 'hot' Jonathan looked Control: Claire commented on how 'hot' Laura looked</p> <p><u>Vignette 11</u> Atypical: You notice a woman sitting in the library with her legs wide open Control: You notice a man sitting in the library with his legs wide open</p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

5.3.1 Sexual insinuation

Female respondents viewed a woman wearing a man's *Speedo* as more unacceptable than the male respondents. Broadly speaking, the results seem to indicate that women generally have slightly more leeway in crossing gender boundaries. However, this is not universal. In instances where behaviour could hint at promiscuity or be viewed as too overtly sexual, it seems women impose narrow behavioural restrictions on themselves and other women. This finding is supported by arguments put forward by numerous theorists including Barky (1990), de Beauvoir (1989) and Gavey (1993). These restrictions may take the form of self-censoring, implicit disapproval, open criticism or

even negative labelling (Unger & Crawford, 1996). It appears women still attach significant value to the ideal of the 'nice girl'. According to popular myth, there are a host of 'things nice girls just don't do'. Any behaviour which could be interpreted as at odds with this 'nice girl' ideology automatically puts the woman in the opposite category; either a woman is a 'nice girl' or she is not. In the domain of women's sexuality, the categories are dichotomous and behavioural policing is exacting (Bohan, 2002, Kitzinger, 1987 & Lorber, 2000). Further, young girls form their identities through connecting with their mothers (Chodorow, 1978 & Gilligan, 1982). Presumably the quintessential mother embodies all that is good, decent and wholesome; that is she epitomises the 'nice girl'. Thus, young girls would understandably be socialised to emulate this role model (Goffman, 1977). These underlying attitudes are not surprising given women's longstanding socialisation where reinforcement and modelling of this ideal is constant (Bartky, 1990 & Millet, 1977).

Another factor which may be partially responsible for the female respondents being more critical could be that women police themselves and one another in order to protect themselves from the threat of sexual aggression. It is widely believed that women 'ask for it' when dressing provocatively or acting in ways that could be construed as promiscuous. Women are taught from a very young age that they are physically vulnerable. As such, they need to avoid situations that could compromise their safety (Gilligan, 1982, Wolf, 1991). It could be speculated that women essentially 'look after' one another through this social policing mechanism. In addition, it may simply be a case of women not wanting

one woman's 'bad' behaviour to tarnish the image of all women. It is apparent that these attitudes are a product of a complexly layered accumulation of experience and exposure.

Our patriarchal history and subsequent socialisation affect both women and men.

However, in this instance it appears that although men may also subscribe to notions of 'nice girl' behaviour, they were not as strongly opposed to this conduct as the female respondents. This may be partially attributable to the way men respond to women as sexualised beings. (McCarl-Nielsen et al, 2000, Unger & Crawford, 1996, West & Zimmerman, 1991). As such, the male respondents may have been sexually titillated by the idea of a semi-clad woman (the question was vague enough to imply that the woman may have been topless). This could also have been amplified by the fact that the respondents, as predominantly young men (constructed as highly sexual), are not necessarily focussed on marriage or long-term prospects, as much as they are on 'having fun'. This may have made them slightly more accepting of behaviour they may have construed as sexually overt, particularly as the situation could also be viewed as potentially advantageous to them. In addition, a woman wearing a man's swimming costume is in no way threatening to their masculinity. This gender non-normative behaviour by women, rather than trying to break into the male domain, merely highlights women as sexual beings and reinforces their role as being attractive and entertaining to men. Implicit here is the 'double bind' that women are placed in (Frye, 1983). Women are expected to be sexually attractive to men whilst still maintaining their purity. It could be speculated that the slightly greater tolerance displayed by the male respondents is more a

function of serving their own interests, as opposed to a genuine freedom as to what women are allowed to wear.

A man wearing a woman's swimming costume was unacceptable to both female and male respondents, although the men rated this behaviour as more unacceptable than the women. This may be because this behaviour is considered too woman-like and therefore could be construed as gay, or even more taboo as cross-dressing (Pleck, 1974, Kimmel & Messner, 1992 & Whitehead, 2001). Male heterosexuality is upheld as the ideal and homosexuality still appears to be relatively unacceptable and feared by heterosexual men (Eisenstein, 1984 & Lorber, 2001). Worse still, cross-dressing is considered deviant and unnatural and even further from being a 'real man' than being homosexual. Cross-dressing violates gender boundaries by superimposing female clothing on a masculine body, thus confusing the most basic definitions of male and female. Any indication of this is enough to incite severe criticism or social censorship by both men and women.

Contrary to how women's violations of certain gender norms are heterosexualised and interpreted as a function of their promiscuity, men's violations of accepted gender norms are homosexualised and call their masculinity into question (McCarl-Nielsen et al, 2000). The results indicate that men and women alike are invested in men behaving like 'real men'. Men police one another more closely and seem to guard their masculinity more fiercely than women.

5.3.2 Appreciation of appearance

In a similar vein, one man complimenting another is interpreted as homosexuality with men overtly censoring these behaviours in other men. Presumably this is their means of policing male sexuality; or more accurately heterosexuality. Male respondents thought this was more unacceptable than their female counterparts. We are left to assume that 'real' or heterosexual men (Biernat, 1991 & Henson & Rogers, 2001) have a blind spot that prevents them from noticing another man's attractiveness. (However, this blind spot appears to be self-correcting when looking at the fairer sex)!

Men and women respondents agreed that it was acceptable practice for a woman to compliment another woman's appearance, this without any suggestion of homosexuality. The apparent latitude men afford to women in this regard may be a form of patronisation and reinforcement of female gender stereotypes. Appearance and vanity are supposedly female preoccupations (Bartky, 1990 & Wolf, 1991). In addition, women are accused of being intrinsically narcissistic and always on the alert for women who may be more attractive and better groomed or dressed than they are (Schopenhauer, 1949). Thus, it could be inferred that women 'naturally' notice one another and compete with one another, and it would therefore not be unusual or unacceptable for one woman to comment on the appearance of another.

5.3.3 Interpretations of body language

Female and male respondents differed in their attitudes to the behaviour of a woman sitting with her legs apart. Female respondents found this behaviour more offensive than male respondents. It seems that women have internalised what they have been taught; that women are expected to behave like ladies and sit with crossed legs (Gavey, 1989). Sitting with ones legs apart would be considered unladylike. Another explanation for their aversion to women assuming this posture may be related to the fact that female behaviours are frequently laden with sexual meaning and interpreted as promiscuous or explicitly sexual (McCarl-Nielsen et al, 2000). In this situation, as in the McCarl-Nielsen et al study (2000), it is possible that women adopting male postures are seen to be sexually forward. Another reason for strong opposition by female respondents could be, once again, that women police one another's behaviour in order to protect themselves. If women are perceived as overtly sexualised it may lead to women, as an homogenous group, seeming more sexually available. This generalised perception places women, as individuals, more at risk of negative or aggressive male behaviour. There is the danger that women will be physically vulnerable and potentially perceived to be deserving of rape, abuse or violence (Bohan, 1993, Chodorow, 1978 & Gilligan, 1982). Thus their disparaging and disapproving attitudes toward one another may serve both to sensor and limit as well as to protect each other.

There was consensus between the sexes that a man assuming a similar posture is neither distasteful, nor provocative. A man sitting with his legs apart is seen as an assertion of his

masculinity, assertiveness is traditionally masculine. Perhaps this is a verification of a shared socialisation that teaches gender difference (Lorber, 2000). That which is deemed acceptable for one gender, such as a seemingly arbitrary posture, is construed as unacceptable for the other (Eagly & Wood, 1991, Goffman, 1977, Turner, 1991).

5.3.4 Knitting in public

Females and males were at variance about the acceptability of a woman knitting in a public space. Contrary to accepted gender norms that regard domestic activities such as sewing and knitting as acceptable female pursuits, the results showed that male respondents considered it more unacceptable for a woman to knit in public, than a man. This anomalous finding is not only difficult to understand in this context, but unlike the behaviours outlined in the other vignettes, it is also not explored in literature that addresses issues of gender. In the absence of a focus group or other such forum the reasons motivating this position cannot be elucidated.

5.4 Category 2: Male - female disagreement on both atypical and control behaviours

This category does not reflect the response to the superficial action outlined in both vignettes, but rather the underlying representation of the respective behaviours. Fighting represents physical dominance and therefore elicits vulnerability. The buying of condoms is more than a purchase, it implies active sexuality. This discussion outlines some of the many potential explanations of the respondent's attitudes.

Vignette 1

Atypical: You see two women standing on Jamison Steps punching one another.

Control: You see two men standing on Jamison Steps punching one another.

Vignette 18

Atypical: You work at the pharmacy on Saturday mornings and last week a woman came in and asked for condoms

Control: You work at the pharmacy on Saturday mornings and last week a man came in and asked for condoms

5.4.1 Physical aggression

The results show women as firmly opposed to fighting, regardless of sex. Again this may be consistent with their socialisation into the role of peacemakers, soothers and ‘fixers’ (Eagly & Wood, 1991 & Goffman, 1977). The process of socialisation also inculcates the notion of women as physically vulnerable and at risk of violence.

Male respondents also thought fighting was unacceptable, but were not as vehement as women on the issue. Perhaps Deutsch and Gerard’s theory of *normative* and *informational influence* (1955) could be usefully applied in an attempt to understand men’s attitudes. According to this theory - that conformity is borne out of a need to be accepted and liked and occurs together with the need to be right - male respondents may merely be conforming to mainstream attitudes. The popular media has lauded the ‘sensitive new-age man’, who is essentially anti-violence. Thus, in order to gain acceptance and hold opinions that are echoed by the larger population, (the ‘right’ opinions), male respondents may simply have adopted the most ‘correct’ attitude. These men would understandably be opposed to violence, but lack the conviction that women respondents demonstrated. It is clear that both men and women experience the proverbial ‘double bind’ (Frye, 1983). New age sensitivity is a modern white, middle-class

requirement. Men are expected to walk a fine line between maintaining their masculinity by being tough (which may require a violent response) and being able to walk away from provocation or confrontation (when necessary). If the violence is judged to have been unnecessary, the man is likely to be criticised for being overly aggressive, but if he walks away too readily he may be described as cowardly.

5.4.2 Purchase of condoms- men versus women

In the same way that vulnerability and fear underlie attitudes to violence, buying condoms is a public declaration of being sexually active. Although women respondents judged the behaviour of a woman purchasing condoms as acceptable, it was rated as less acceptable than for men. Women's policing of one another in this regard may, in part, be attributable to the comment such a purchase makes on that woman's relationship to sex. Generally, attitudes to sex are not as rigid or inflexible as they once were and sexual activity is viewed as acceptable practice between consenting adults. However, shifts in attitudes may not be as dramatic as they appear. This is consistent with theories and findings cited by Augoustinos & Walker (1995) and Crandall, Eshelman & O'Brien (2002). We could speculate that traditional views are still powerful and women appear to have internalised and integrated them (Crandall, et al., 2002). The underpinnings of such views are that it is not feminine for women to be sexually forward or aggressive. In addition, romantic ideals dictate that men should be the suitors who should woo women. Giving in to a man's 'understandable' sexual persistence is reasonable in the context of a woman becoming so aroused so as to be unable to contain herself and maintains the socialised moral

imperative of women as sexually naïve and merely responsive. Thus, a woman who is proactive in protecting herself against possible pregnancy or sexually transmitted diseases defies this norm. In this context it is understood that she intended to have sex and was not merely innocent and passive. She is therefore not just ‘sugar and spice and all things nice’, but is openly admitting sexual desires and needs. Further, this understanding is supported by women’s acceptance of men buying condoms, which is construed positively as a responsible, mature approach. Being sexually adventurous is expected in the gender that is made up of ‘frogs and snails and puppy dogs’ tails. Men are by ‘nature’ daring, adventurous and slightly unsavoury and hence this behaviour would be in keeping with who they are (Kimmel, 1999).

5.5 Category 3: Behavioural monitoring by both males and females: in-group and between-group

The responses in the following category illustrate how behaviour is policed by both sexes. Men and women endorse gender role differences. The discussion centres on the reinforcement of traditional gender roles through mutual censorship of ‘unacceptable’ behaviours.

| |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><u>Vignette 2</u> Atypical: Heather's boyfriend regularly buys Fairlady, Femina & Cosmopolitan Control: Jim's girlfriend regularly buys Car Magazine & Men's Health</p> <p><u>Vignette 3</u> Atypical: You're on a bus that is overcrowded. A man climbs on and looks for a seat. A woman gets up and offers her seat. Control: You're on a bus that is overcrowded. A woman climbs on and looks for a seat. A man gets up and offers his seat.</p> <p><u>Vignette 7</u> Atypical: There is a couple in your tutorial, whenever they enter or leave the lecture hall, the woman always steps aside and opens the door for her boyfriend Control: There is a couple in your tutorial, whenever they enter or leave the lecture hall, the man always steps aside and opens the door for his girlfriend.</p> <p><u>Vignette 9</u> Atypical: Melissa asked Kevin out on a date and paid for the evening</p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Control: Kevin asked Melissa out on a date & paid for the evening
Vignette 12
Atypical: Sarah's brother entered a male beauty pageant
Control: Sarah's sister entered a female beauty pageant
Vignette 13
Atypical: There's a woman in your Psych tutorial that has hairy legs and armpits
Control: There's a man in your Psych tutorial that has hairy legs and armpits
Vignette 15
Atypical: At a residence formal ball you see two men dancing together.
Control: At a residence formal ball you see two women dancing together.
Vignette 21
Atypical: There was a man in a women's clothing shop trying on skirts.
Control: There was a woman in a man's clothing shop trying on men's suits.

Eight vignettes fell into this category. Four of the behaviours censored men and four censored women. It is apparent that the monitoring of these behaviours by both men and women revolve around a similar theme; that is opposite sides of the same coin. Men and women aspire to be 'normal' with men needing to behave like 'real men' and thus not engage in activities that could be perceived as emasculating. Similarly women should not emasculate men by emulating or adopting traditionally masculine behaviours (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). The shared socialisation seems to have created consensus between the sexes in this regard (Goffman, 1977). Both women and men understand the implicit, unspoken 'rules' of gendered behaviour (Bartky, 1990).

5.5.1 Gendered behaviours as a threat to masculinity: homosexuality and emasculation

In keeping with normative prescriptions and the spirit of gender difference, male and female respondents alike felt that men should not read women's magazines, wear women's clothing or partake in traditionally female activities such as exhibiting themselves in frivolous beauty pageants where the only 'merit' or 'talent' required is to be beautiful. (Partaking in body building competitions where physical strength and muscle

tone is put on display is considered more fitting and acceptable for men). Such activities were presumably seen as unmanly and potentially emasculating (Henson & Rogers, 2001). 'Real men' are hunters and sportsmen (Pleck, 1985), not slaves to fashion. Perhaps men's recreational interests are closely curbed in an effort to avoid gay labelling (Burn, 1996). The superior masculine status needs to be fiercely guarded as different and separate from female status. Two men dancing together crosses the line of acceptable behaviour and an assumption about their homosexual orientation is likely to be made. Same-sex affection is only permissible for women, who are 'by nature' sensitive and caring and emotionally demonstrative (Eagly & Wood, 1991 & Goffman, 1977). Any behaviour that is too feminine is construed as emasculating and may elicit the 'inversion sexuality theory', that is, that homosexuals are similar to members of the opposite sex (Deaux & Major, 1987). As such, any man who partakes in these activities compromises his masculinity; he may be considered too effeminate and possibly homosexual (Whitehead, 2001).

Both sexes agree that it is not acceptable practice for women to behave like men. It can be speculated that this is related to how women have been socially constructed as the 'weaker' sex, in need of male protection and care (Goffman, 1977). It is therefore part of the male 'job description' to look after women, without which men stand to lose an aspect of their male identity (Pleck, 1981). Thus, it appears that women are compelled to guard against emasculating men by acting like them. This would also upset longstanding norms and create gender role confusion. It seems that changing or pushing gender boundaries creates a measure of discomfort probably related to unfamiliarity (Bem, 1981). Further,

by partaking in traditionally male 'caring for women' behaviours, such as opening doors or offering seats, women run the risk of being construed as too manly or 'butch' (Biernat, 1991). Taking this one step further, and usurping the male role as initiator by asking a man out on a date, would probably not be interpreted as romantic or chivalrous, but rather as sexually forward. A woman who brazenly hijacks the male mission is quite likely to be seen as having a predatory desire to have sex.

Coupled with the social directive that women not conduct themselves like men, is the dictate that they should not look like men. Female and male respondents were unanimous in the opinion that the ideal of female beauty should be maintained. Beauty for women is tantamount to soft, smooth and hairless. An unshaven woman defies this ideal and presumably looks too manly. Women are evaluated in terms of their attractiveness to men (Barky, 1990 & Wolf, 1991). A hairy woman is unattractive to men, considered "not kissable" (McCarl-Nielsen et al, 2000) and therefore has little worth. Every woman must adhere to the quintessential archetype of female beauty or risk being undesirable (Barky, 1990). The results clearly indicate that women have internalised notions of beauty and want to be feminine and beautiful as dictated by male standards. Having internalised and adopted these normative standards, women are not merely 'self-policing' (Barky, 1990), they carefully scrutinise the behaviour of other women as well.

Essentially there is agreement between the sexes about the gender appropriateness or inappropriateness of behaviours. The results point to women and men being uneasy with the transgression of traditional gender boundaries.

5.6 Category 4: Degree of acceptability or unacceptability of behaviours is gender dependant

In the following category female and male respondents disagreed about the degree of acceptability or unacceptability of specific gendered behaviours. Various themes emerged and are discussed in further detail.

Vignette 10

Atypical: A man in your class bought flowers for another man

Control: A woman in your class bought flowers for another woman

Vignette 16

Atypical: Three women were sitting at a sidewalk café whistling and catcalling a number of men who walked past.

Control: Three men were sitting at a sidewalk café whistling and catcalling a number of women who walked past.

Vignette 17

Atypical: Karen's father threw a Tupperware party and invited your mother

Control: Karen's mother threw a Tupperware party and invited your mother

Vignette 19

Atypical: One of the male lecturers regularly wears lipstick and mascara to class

Control: One of the female lecturers regularly wears lipstick and mascara to class

Vignette 20

Atypical: A woman sitting on a barstool at a local pub pinched the barman's bum as he passed her

Control: A man sitting on a barstool at a local pub pinched the barlady's bum as she passed him

5.6.1 Buying flowers

Two themes emerged from the behaviours grouped in this category. The first theme is a comment on women's natural 'feminine' inclinations (Lorber, 2000). The second theme appears to revolve around the restriction of male behaviour; more specifically, around behaviours that raise the question of men's sexuality (Whitehead, 2001).

The buying of flowers conjures up images of romance, typically a man, in pursuit of a woman, would acceptably engage in such a romantic act. Apparently, it is also acceptable practice for a woman to buy flowers for another woman. This is not interpreted as a comment on her sexuality, but rather ascribed to woman's 'nature'; as women are

sensitive and thoughtful by nature, and thus, affection between women is permissible or 'natural' (Pleck, 1985). Both women and men felt comfortable with such a gesture between women. When such an action was performed from man to man, it was less acceptable for both women and men. It can thus be hypothesized that a man showing sensitivity and care towards another may be interpreted as sexual interest and call his sexual orientation into question (Whitehead, 2001). It is interesting that a mere gesture of kindness is interpreted as sexual.

The question of buying flowers for the opposite sex was not raised. However, it could be speculated that due to traditional gender normative standards of this gesture being an accepted male-female wooing practice, it would be considered completely acceptable behaviour, male to female. If a woman were to buy flowers for a man it would probably be interpreted, not as romantic, but as a blatant sexual overture. This was evidenced in the McCarl-Nielsen study (2000) where a female student who enacted this gender norm violation by sending flowers to a man, in her feedback argued that she was as entitled as a man to make her sexual intentions clear. It is apparent that gender norms have been internalised by both women and men, and that this informs thinking and behaviour (West & Zimmerman, 1991). In the same way that there is a tension for men between being masculine yet sensitive, women have to be attractive and feminine, yet modest. There is a fine distinguishing line between the two. The expectations are that women should be attractive to men and a little flirtatious, but being too attractive or overly flirtatious could shift the balance from being desirable coy/virginal to loose promiscuous and whore-like (Frye, 1983).

5.6.2 Unacceptability of Tupperware parties for men

It appears that the restrictions on male behaviours are extensive and men constantly need to negotiate the fine line between being sensitive and 'new-age' whilst not being too effeminate. The notion that domestic and household chores are still women's responsibility appears to be firmly entrenched. Men found Tupperware parties to be more unacceptable when hosted by a man. This may in part be due to historical understandings of domesticity being woman's domain. Although gender roles have metamorphosed to some extent in contemporary culture, there is evidence of sex role strain; men have internalised traditional male normative behaviours that are at odds with their roles as modern men (Pleck, 1981). It seems that the new-age sensitive man is permitted to be involved domestically to some extent. For example, cooking for men is more common; yet baking would probably be construed as crossing the line of acceptability. The same applies to shopping; grocery shopping would presumably be tolerable, but choosing utensils, bowls (Tupperware) unbecoming for a man. It is apparent that behaviourally men are extremely limited. Women are critical of gender inappropriate behaviour for men, and men are also critical of one another in this regard.

Despite the behaviour in this vignette primarily eliciting censorship of male conduct, the 'double bind' of women is also implied (Frye, 1983). Domesticity is the designated realm of women. Women are expected to be homemakers and nurturers, but not dowdy housewives. Thus, attention to physical appearance is necessary whilst not being overly attentive or neglecting household responsibilities.

5.6.3 Make-up implies homosexuality in men, narcissism in women

Women, who are pre-occupied with their appearances, are labelled as narcissistic (Bartky, 1990). Female vanity is 'natural' and thus, expected (de Beauvoir, 1989, Kayoka, 2001 & Schopenhauer, 1949). It is consistent with their trophy-status: women need to be attractive to men and thus groom themselves accordingly (Kayoka, 2001). Men, on the other hand, should not be concerned with trivia such as physical appearance. Male respondents were more opposed to men wearing make-up than female respondents. Perhaps this could be attributed to the idea that a man who glamorises himself in traditionally female ways, such as wearing mascara and lipstick would probably be considered gay (trying to attract a man's attention in the same way women do) or cross-dressing. With heterosexuality as 'normal' (Schmidt & Eagly, 2002), a gay label is tantamount to abnormal. In the same way that a man wearing a woman's swimming costume raised the possibility that he was a cross-dresser, it could also be speculated that a man wearing mascara and lipstick could be given the same negative label. As discussed previously, being seen as a cross-dresser is more deviant than being considered gay, and is feared by heterosexual men (Eisenstein, 1984 & Lorber, 2001). Cross-dressing is constructed as a merging of gender boundaries resulting in confusion of the fundamental differences between men and women.

Neither men nor women are comfortable with men being too feminine. Notions of what it means to be a 'real man' appear to be intact. Essentially, there is consensus that men should stay away from what has traditionally been regarded as women's domain, that is

the sphere of fashion and beauty. Both men and women object to a man attempting to enhance his looks by wearing lipstick and mascara. It is acceptable practice for women to beautify themselves by wearing fashionable clothing and make-up. Women who personify femininity and ideals of female beauty are considered 'normal' (Prentice & Carranza, 2002).

5.6.4 Sexual harassment

Feminine beauty is linked to vulnerability and sexual vulnerability to men. The issue raised here is that of gender-based power. Men are able to catcall to women, or pinch their bums without fear of danger to their physical safety. Abstaining from these behaviours is probably related to legal, social and/or moral censoring. Unlike men, women face physical threat if they were to enact such behaviours. Women would be at a decided physical disadvantage if men were to respond seriously to what was intended as a 'playful' gesture. Women are acutely aware of their vulnerability it is taught to them from a very early age (Goffman, 1977). In particular, women are taught that they are sexually vulnerable and should constantly be aware of the need to protect themselves from the threat of sexual assault or rape.

Men are not socialised in this way, they are not prepared to become victims. As such, infrastructures that have been put in place for women such as rape crisis centres or centres for abused/battered women are not available for men. The underlying assumption is that 'real men' cannot be raped or physically hurt. Thus, if a man were to be sexually violated

he would not only carry a shameful secret, but would possibly have to question his basic gendered identity. The magnitude and pervasiveness of gender in defining our identities is plain and furthermore, it is a clear illustration of how we, as men and women respectively, 'grow' into our gendered identities (Meena, 1992).

Men and women unanimously agree that behaviours that constituted sexual harassment, (catcalling or pinching the bum of a member of the opposite sex), were unacceptable. However, there was a difference between women and men participants as to the degree of unacceptability. Women were more opposed to these behaviours than men. Large-scale media exposure as well as the current political climate in South Africa with our progressive constitution, has created awareness around issues of sexual harassment. The legal and financial implications of a 'guilty verdict' in television dramas, novels and cinema have been publicised and provides support for an element of political correctness, including social and legal repercussions, possibly affecting the attitudes of the participants in this study. Even though male participants rated these behaviours as unacceptable; they did not feel these behaviours were as objectionable as the female respondents did. It is possible that the motivation for male respondents putting forward such attitudes were, in part due to what Aronson (1976) refers to as 'normative prescriptions'. Aronson theorises that compliance to normative behaviours occurs as a result of a reward - punishment system. In this instance, men refrain and berate sexually harassing behaviours in order to receive social rewards and avoid social punishment.

The attitudes adopted by men and women to these behaviours are informed by a number of factors, which are interwoven. On a personal level it is apparent that women and men police one another, and on a political level, the law offers protection. Traditional understandings of what constitutes masculinity and femininity are essentially unchanged; it is merely the degree of acceptability or unacceptability that has shifted. Social censure is powerful (Bartky, 1990 & Connell, 1995) as evidenced by the findings that gender biased attitudes manifest mainly in subtle discrepancies. Behaviours that are stereotypically masculine are considered slightly less acceptable for women than men, and stereotypically female behaviours are slightly less acceptable when performed by men. The belief in essential gender differences is implicit in these attitudes (Bohan, 1993).

5.7 Category 5: Male and female agreement on gender appropriate behaviours

Female and male participants were in agreement regarding the acceptability of the behaviours in this category. A discussion accounting for these similarities in attitudes is outlined.

| |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Vignette 4</u> Atypical: A female student placed an advert with 'date-line.com' for a suitable male partner Control: A male student placed an advert with 'date-line.com' for a suitable female partner <u>Vignette 14</u> Atypical: At Billy's Bar, Jenny bought Mark a drink and asked if he'd like to dance Control: At Billy's Bar, Mark bought Jenny a drink and asked if she'd like to dance |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

5.7.1 Internet dating

Neither female nor male participants were opposed to the concept of on-line advertising for partners of the opposite sex. This behaviour was considered acceptable practice for both women and men. It is possible that the attitudes of acceptance are, to some extent, due to internet dating being a modern practice. The internet has no history attached to it, nor longstanding prescriptions of how it should be used or by whom. The power of social construction is apparent here (Gergen, 1999); that which is constructed as acceptable and gender-neutral is practiced as such. Both females and males in this study are likely to have similar access to internet sites and chat rooms. In addition, there is an element of anonymity as users can decide whether or not they would like to reveal themselves or remain behind the computer screen. Its popularity (and acceptability) is also probably attributable to it being perceived as non-threatening. In contrast to a personal meeting, where women particularly, would be aware of potential danger, any immediate physical danger in this instance is avoided. It should be noted that this scenario assumes a particular class and educational status and ignores the diverse gendered experiences afforded by such status (Mama, 1997).

5.7.2 Acceptability of buying drinks

The buying of drinks also assumes middle class status as well as economic means. The respondents found this behaviour to be acceptable practice, regardless of sex.

A woman can buy a drink for a man. A man can buy a drink for a woman. It is interesting to note that in the McCarl-Nielsen et al. study (2000) a woman buying a drink for a man was categorised as an 'explicitly sexual' behaviour. However, when a woman asked a man out on a date this was seen as 'unexplicitly sexual'.

The respondents in this study expressed attitudes that were at variance with those voiced in the McCarl-Nielsen et al. (2000) study. They felt it was slightly less acceptable for a woman to ask a man out on a date (than for a man to ask a woman out on a date), but were completely comfortable with a woman buying a man a drink. Perhaps the difference in perception lies in the spontaneity of the gesture. A woman who buys a drink for a man could be acting on an impulse to be friendly. Such a gesture is not premeditated, whereas asking a man out on a date is. Thus, the spontaneity of the action leaves little room to interpret such conduct as forward or overtly sexual, making it acceptable. For a woman to be mildly flirtatious is indicative of her striking the correct balance; she has not overstepped the mark into the arena of being a sexual predator who makes her designs obvious. It is also possible that given the climate of gender equality, of women being equal players, that a woman buying a drink for a man is simply exercising her economic independence/equality. It should be noted that this scenario of a woman in a bar is both culturally and class specific.

The behaviours discussed in this category were equally acceptable for both women and men. However, it is apparent that the nature of these behaviours is class specific and therefore only applicable in this context.

5.8 Category 6: A thematic comparison of female and male rating of the 5 most inappropriate behaviours

The following category consists of the 5 most unacceptable behaviours rated by female respondents as well as male respondents.

Female Participants:

| |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Vignette 20</u> Control: A man sitting on a barstool at a local pub pinched the barlady's bum as she passed him |
| <u>Vignette 1</u> Atypical: You see two women standing on Jamison Steps punching one another. Control: You see two men standing on Jamison Steps punching one another. |
| <u>Vignette 11</u> Atypical: You notice a woman sitting in the library with her legs wide open. |
| <u>Vignette 5</u> Atypical: At Vanessa's braai, her brother was lying at the pool in a woman's bikini bottom Control: At Vanessa's braai her sister was lying at the pool in a man's speedo |
| <u>Vignette 19</u> Atypical: One of the male lecturers regularly wears lipstick and mascara to class. |

Male Participants

| |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Vignette 20</u> Control: A man sitting on a barstool at a local pub pinched the bariady's bum as she passed him |
| <u>Vignette 1</u> Atypical: You see two women standing on Jamison Steps punching one another. Control: You see two men standing on Jamison Steps punching one another. |
| <u>Vignette 5</u> Atypical: At Vanessa's braai, her brother was lying at the pool in a woman's bikini bottom |
| <u>Vignette 19</u> Atypical: One of the male lecturers regularly wears lipstick and mascara to class. |
| <u>Vignette 21</u> Atypical: There was a man in a women's clothing shop trying on skirts. |

Female respondents were most intolerant of men violating gender boundaries in two broad behavioural spheres. The first of these is when such violations could potentially pose a threat to their physical safety, more particularly, sexual threats: the vignette depicting a man pinching a woman's bum was considered the most unacceptable of all the given behaviours. Male respondents echoed this rating of intolerance for such an overt, stereotypical example of sexual harassment. However, as discussed previously, it could be speculated that this is, at least in part, a function of distancing themselves from this particularly incorrect behaviour.

Violence in general was considered unacceptable by both men and women. Again, the stronger opposition voiced by women, lends support to the underlying fear that women, as the 'weaker sex', have of being physically violated or victimised.

The second 'type' of behaviour that female respondents deemed as unacceptable for men concerned issues of physical appearance and vanity. Female respondents were opposed to men regularly wearing mascara and lipstick. That the seemingly innocuous behaviour of a man wearing mascara and lipstick was rated as inappropriate highlights the depth and strength of gender inculcation. As discussed previously, vanity is women's domain and women are not partial to encroaching males. It is apparent that the male respondents share this view. However, for men the concern centres on being construed as homosexual. Essentially there is a mutual understanding that men should not emasculate themselves by acting like women. This is further supported by the perception that wearing a swimming costume designed for the opposite sex is unacceptable for men as 'appearing' too woman-like and may call a man's masculinity and sexuality into question.

Aversion to a woman in a man's swimming costume could be a function of the implied toplessness. Nudity or partial nudity is likely to be seen as too sexually explicit or too manly, and would thus understandably be censored. Promiscuity or perceived promiscuity was rated by female respondents as unacceptable behaviour for women. Overtly sexual behaviour is considered to be unacceptable as sexually provocative behaviour is potentially dangerous.

Male respondents were primarily concerned with behaviours that threaten their masculinity. It is apparent from these results that men place more limitations on each other's behaviour and guard against emasculating themselves by behaving like women. It seems that the restrictions are imposed as a means of re-iterating gender difference.

5.9 Tolerance and transgression of gender boundaries

The results section closes with the behaviours tabulated comparatively for each gender. It is evident (see Table 14), that men are much more critical of other men than women are of one another. Men rated four behaviours as unacceptable practice for men only, as compared with one that women deemed unacceptable for members of their own gender only. Perhaps this is indicative of a higher level of tolerance towards women who transgress gender boundaries. It could be argued that the feminist movement has broadened the range of acceptable gendered behaviour for women thus allowing women greater leeway than men.

The results displayed in Tables 14 and 16 respectively outline entrenched subtle gender biases, which continue to prevail. In essence it seems that traditional gender norms still exist, it is only the degree that varies. Underlying gender expectations come to the fore when gender boundaries are crossed as evidenced in the subtle prejudices dictating that certain actions are marginally less acceptable for one sex than for the other. Behaving in 'gentlemanly' ways is still more appropriate for men, whilst concern with appearance is slightly more acceptable for women than for their male counterparts. Perhaps the reason

that these biases are only expressed subtly is that the population is a young and educated one, a group of individuals who presumably understand concepts of gender equality and non-discrimination, people who are aware of the social consequences of adopting current gender-sensitive attitudes. Augoustinos & Walker (1995) contend that attitudes are slow to change, and the subtle biases elicited in this study, confirm this assertion. Perhaps participants are exercising a measure of compliance with expected attitudes whilst suppressing thoughts and feelings that they understand might be viewed as inappropriate or incorrect (Kelman, 1958). This would also be consistent with the findings of Crandall et al. (2002); prejudice or discrimination is infrequent when overtly measured, but when measured “unobtrusively” is more prevalent.

5.10 Limitations of the Study

Being gendered is different for men and women (Mama, 1997). Difference of experience is also related to race, religion, class and socio-economic status. This study targeted a specific segment of the population; a predominantly young, white, middle class student population.

It should be borne in mind that gender identity changes with age and context (Goffman, 1977), and that this population group is still relatively young, still “trying on” their gender (Williams, 2002). Peer influence is paramount and theories such as that proposed by Deutsch & Gerard (1955) would probably apply. Their theory of normative and

informational influence posits that individuals conform out of the need to be accepted and the need to be right. This age group would probably be highly susceptible to these needs.

This study was based on a qualitative study (McCarl-Nielsen et al., 2000), in which the participants violated gender norms in actual situations. It is recognised that this study asks questions which can be answered 'theoretically'. For example, participants may rate a hypothetical behavioural scenario as acceptable, but the reality of encountering such an action might not seem as acceptable.

Another possible limitation is that of the language used in the questionnaires. The questionnaire was administered in English as the sample group attend an English university. However, it did not account for lack of fluency in English, which may have affected responses to certain questions.

The concept of Tupperware parties is culturally biased and may not be meaningful or understood in differing contexts. Furthermore, the vignettes were classist as evidenced in the scenarios involving a swimming pool and assumed computer literacy and access, respectively. Thus, the attitudes demonstrated are specific to this particular population group.

These limitations occurred in an attempt to describe behaviours as vividly as possible, in lieu of not being able to enact the actual behaviours depicted in the McCarl-Nielsen et al. (2000) study.

5.11 Recommendations

- Focus groups would be useful to determine the motivations for specific answers and thus deepen the understanding of these attitudes. This would be particularly effective in providing explanations for ratings that were anomalous and difficult to understand, such as the vignette depicting knitting in public.
- Administering this questionnaire in different faculties and different years of study would allow an opportunity to assess whether gender biased attitudes vary in the 'hard' sciences as opposed to the 'liberal' arts and whether age has bearing on such attitudes.
- Administering this questionnaire to different universities would give the researcher access to different race groups, which would provide a more accurate reflection of gender attitudes in a broader South African context.
- The questionnaire could be used as a template and vignettes that are context-specific could be developed. An example would be that of locating vignettes in rural settings.

References

- Anastasi, A. (1990). *Psychological testing (6th ed.)*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Ajzen, I. (1988). *Attitudes, personality and behaviour*. Chicago: Dorsey Press.
- Ajzen, I. (2001). Nature and operation of attitudes. *Annual Review Psychology*, 52, 27-58.
- Allport, G. W. (1968). The historical background of modern social psychology. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology*, 1, (2nd ed.). Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Aronson, E. (1976). *The social animal (2nd ed.)*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and company.
- Augoustinos, M. & Walker, I. (1995). *Social cognition: an integrated introduction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage publications.
- Bartky, S. L. (1990). *Femininity and domination: studies in phenomenology of oppression*. New York: Routledge.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review*, 88, 4, 354-364.
- Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bermant, G., Kelman, H. C., & Warwick, D. P. (1978). *The ethics of social intervention*. Washington: Halsted press.
- Biernat, M. (1991). Gender stereotypes and the relationship between masculinity and femininity: A developmental analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 3, 351- 365.
- Bohan, J. S. (1993). Regarding gender: Essentialism, constructionism and feminism psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 17, 5-21.
- Bohan, J. S. (2002) Sex differences and/in the self: Classic themes, feminist variations, postmodern challenges. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 74-88.
- Browne, K. (1998). *Divided labours: An evolutionary view of women at work*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

- Budlender, D. (1998). *Women and men in South Africa*. Central Statistics Online Retrieved May 21, 2003 from, <http://www.africaaction.org/docs98/gen9809.htm>
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Burn, S. M. (1996). *The social psychology of gender*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Child, D. (1970). *The essentials of factor analysis*. London: Halt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Chodorow, N. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering*. Berkely: University of California Press.
- Cialdini, R. B. & Trost, M. R. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, conformity and compliance. In D. T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology Vol. 2* (pp. 151 - 192). Boston: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Cornelius, R.R. & Averill, J.R. (1983). Sex differences in fear of spiders. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 377-383.
- Cornwall, A. & Lindisfarne, N. (1996). Dislocating masculinity: gender, power and anthropology. In A. Cornwall & N. Lindisfarne (Eds.), *Dislocating masculinity: comparative ethnographies* (pp. 11- 47). London: Routledge.
- Cureton, E. E. & D' Agostino, R. B. (1983). *Factor analysis*. London: Laurence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Crandall, C. S., Eshelman, A. & O'Brien, L. (2002). Social norms and the expression and suppression of prejudice: The struggle for internationalisation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 3, 359-378.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Deaux, K. (1985). Sex and gender. *Annual Review Psychology*, 36, 49-81.
- Deaux, K. & Lanfrance, M. (1998). Gender. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology Vol. 2* (pp. 788-827). Boston: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Deaux, K. & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender-related behaviour. *Psychological Review*, 94, 369 - 389.

- De Beauvoir, S. (1989). *The second sex*. USA: Vintage Books
- Delphy, C. (1993). Rethinking sex and gender. *Women Studies International Forum*, 16, 1-9.
- Deutsch, M. & Gerald, H. B. (1955). A study of normative and informational social influences upon individual judgement. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 55, 626-636.
- Dowden, S. & Robinson, J. P. (1993). Age and cohort differences in American racial attitudes: The generational replacement hypothesis revisited. In P. M. Sniderman, P.E. Tetlock & E. G. Carmines (Eds.), *Prejudice, politics and the American dilemma* (pp. 86-103). Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press.
- Eagly, A. H. & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 15, 4, 543-558.
- Eagly, A. H. & Wood, W. (1991). Explaining sex differences in social behaviour: a meta-analytic perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 17, 3, 306-375.
- Eisenstein, H. (1984). *Contemporary feminist thought*. London: Union Paperbook.
- Ellis, N. (1934). *Man and women, a study of second and tertiary sex characteristics* (8th rev. ed.). London: Heinemann.
- Faludi, S. (1999). *Stiffed: The betrayal of the American man*. Perennial: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology Vol. 2* (pp. 357-414). Boston: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Frye, M. (1983). *The politics of reality: Essays in feminist theory*. Freedom, California: Crossing Press.
- Gavey, N. (1989). "Feminist post-structuralism and discourse analysis: contributions to feminist psychology". *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 13, 459- 475.
- Gavey, N. (1993). Technologies and effects of heterosexual coercion. In S. Wilkinson & C. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Heterosexuality: A feminism and psychology reader* (pp. 93-119). London: Sage Publishers.
- Geddes, P. & Thompson, J.A. (1889). *The evolution of sex*. London: Scott.
- Gergen, K. J. (1999). *An invitation to social construction*. London: Sage Publications.

- Gergen, K. J. (2001). *Social construction in context*. London: Sage Publications.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1977). The arrangement between the sexes. *Theory and Society*, 4, 3, 301-331.
- Golding, J.M. & Singer, J. L. (1983). Patterns of inner experience: Daydreaming styles, depressive moods, and sex roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 663-675.
- Hall, G. S. (1905). *Adolescence*. New York: Appleton.
- Hare- Mustin, R. T. & Marecek, J. (1988). The meaning of difference: Gender theory, postmodernism and psychology. *American Psychologist*, 43, 455-464.
- Hare- Mustin, R. T. & Marecek, J. (1990). *Making a difference: Psychology and construction of gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hegstrom, J.L. & McCarl-Nielsen, S. (2002). Gender and metaphor: Description of familiar persons. *Discourse Processes*, 33, 3, 219-234.
- Hensen, K. D. & Rogers, J. K. (2001). "Why Marcia you've changed!" male clerical temporary workers doing masculinity in a feminised occupation. *Gender and Society*, 15, 2, 218-238.
- Hechschild, A. (1990). *The second shift*. New York: Avon.
- Howell, D. C. (1992). *Statistical methods for psychology (3rd ed.)*. Boston: PWS-Kent Publishing Company.
- Howell, D. C. (1995). *Fundamental statistics for the behavioural sciences (3rd ed.)*. California, Duxbury Press.
- Imam, A. M. (1997). Engendering African social sciences: An introductory essay. In A. M. Imam, A. Mama & F. Sow (Eds.), *Engendering African social sciences* (pp. 1-29). Dakar, Senegal: CODESRIA.
- Jacobson, J. A. (1995). *Gender inequality at work*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Johannesen -Schmidt, M. C. & Eagly, A. H. (2002). Another look at sex differences in preferred mate characteristics: The effects of endorsing the traditional female gender role. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 322-328.

- Jewkes, R. & Abrahams, N. (2002). The epidemiology of rape and sexual coercion in South Africa: An overview. *Social Science Medicine*, 55, 1231- 1244.
- Kimmel, M. S. (1987). *Changing men: New directions in research on men and masculinity*. California: Sage Publications.
- Kimmel, M. S. (1999). Saving the males: The sociological implications of the Virginia Military Institute and the Citadel. *Gender and Society*, 14, 4, 494-516.
- Kimmel, M. S. & Messner, M. A. (1992) . Introduction. In M. S. Kimmel & M. A. Messner (Eds.), *Men 's lives* (pp. 1-11). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Kitzinger, C. (1987). *The social construction of lesbianism*. London: Sage Publications.
- Kitzinger, C. (1991). "Feminism, psychology and the paradox of power". *Feminism and Psychology*, 1, 1, 111-129.
- Kayoka, M. M. C. (2001). *Gender representatives and culture: A critical survey of Tanzanian entertainment newspapers*. (Electronic version) Retrieved July 20, 2003, from <http://www.artnet.com.br/~mark/kayoka.html>-101k
- Kunda, Z. (1999). *Social cognition: Making sense of people*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT press.
- Langston, D. (1998). Class and inequality: tired of playing monopoly? In M. L. Anderson & H. P. Collins (3rd ed.), *Race, class and gender: An anthology* (pp. 126-136). California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Lorber, J. (2000). Using gender to undo gender: A feminist degendering movement. *Feminist Theory*, 1, 1, 79 -95.
- Mama, A. (1997). Shedding the masks and tearing the veils: Cultural studies for post-colonial Africa. In A. M. Imam, A. Mama & F. Sow (Eds.), *Engendering African social sciences* (pp. 61- 80). Dakar, Senegal: CODESRIA.
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1969). *Basic writings on politics and philosophy*. London: Collins.
- Meena, R. (1992). Gender research/studies in Southern Africa: An overview. In R. Meena (ed.), *Gender in Southern Africa: Conceptual and theoretical issues* (pp. 1-30). Harare: Sapes.
- McCarl-Nielsen, J., Walden, G. & Kunkel, C.A. (2000). Gendered heteronormativity: Empirical illustrations in everyday life. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 41, 2, 283- 298.

- Milkie, M. A. (2002). Contested images of femininity: An analysis of cultural gatekeepers' struggles with the "real girl" critique. *Gender and Society*, 16, 6, 839-859.
- Miller, J. B. (1976). *Toward a new psychology of women*. Boston: Beacon.
- Millett, K. (1977). *Sexual politics*. London: Virago.
- Parsons, T. (1952). *The social system*. New York: Free Press.
- Plant, E. A., Hyde, J. S., Keltner, D. & Devine, P. G. (2000). The gender stereotyping of emotions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 81-92.
- Pleck, J. H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.
- Pleck, J. H. (1985). *Working wives, working husbands*. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.
- Pleck, J. H. (1992). Men's power with women, other men, and society: A men's movement analysis. In M.S. Kimmel & M.A. Messner (Eds.), *Men's lives* (pp. 19-27). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Prentice, D. A. & Carranza, E. (2002). What women and men should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be, and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 269-281.
- Reskin, B. F. & Padavic, I. (1994). *Women and men at work*. Thousand Oaks, California: Pine Forge Press.
- Ricciardelli, L. A., & Williams, R. J. (1995). Desirable and undesirable gender traits in three behavioural domains. *Sex Roles*, 33, 637-52.
- Rich, A. C. (1986). *"Of woman born: motherhood as experienced and institution"*. New York: Newton.
- Richardson, D. (1996). Heterosexuality and social theory. In D. Richardson (ed.), *Theorising heterosexuality* (pp. 1-20). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Riggs, D. (1983). *War in the nursery: Theories of the child and mother*. London: Virago.
- Robson, C. (1993). *Real world research*. Oxford, UK.: Blackwell Publishers.
- Rosenberg, C. (1976). *No other gods: On science and American social thought*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Rosnow, R. L. & Rosenthal, R. (1996). *Beginning behavioural research: A conceptual primer (2nd ed.)*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall International, Inc.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Governing the soul: The shaping of the private self (2nd ed.)*. London: Free Association Books.
- SA News. Friday 11 April 2003. *Drizzle as Rain Queen crowed*. Retrieved December 02, 2003 from <http://iafrica.com/news/sa/228446.htm>.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1949). *Philosophy of Arthur Schopenhauer*. New York: Tudor.
- Scott, J. W. (1988). Deconstructing equality versus difference. *Feminist Studies*, 14, 33-50.
- Shields, S.A. (1975). Functionalism, Darwinism, and the psychology of women: A study in social myth. *American Psychologist*, 30, 739-753.
- Sherif, C. W. (1982). Needed concepts in the study of gender identity. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 6, 4, 375- 398.
- Stopher, P. R. & Meyburg, A. H. (1979). *Survey sampling and multivariate analysis for social scientist and engineers*. Toronto: Lexington Book D.C Heath and company.
- Tang, T. N. & Tang, C. S. (2001). Gender role internalisation, multiple roles, and Chinese women's mental health. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 25, 181-196.
- Thorne, B. (1992). "Girls and boys together... but mostly apart: gender arrangements in elementary schools". In M.S. Kimmel & M.A. Messner (Eds.), *Men's lives* (pp. 108-122). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Threadgold, T. & Cranny-Francis, A. (1990). *Feminine - masculine and representation*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Turner, C. J. (1991). *Social influence*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Tyson, G. (1991). Methodological perspectives. In D. Foster & J. Louw-Potgieter (Eds.), *Social psychology in South Africa* (pp. 93-117) Johannesburg: Lexicon Publishers.
- Unger, R. K. & Crawford, M. (1996). *Women and Gender: A Feminist Psychology (2nd ed)*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Van Every, J. (1996). Heterosexuality and domestic life. In D. Richardson (ed.), *Theorising heterosexuality* (pp. 39-54). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Von Hippel, W. Hawkins, C. & Schooler, W.J. (2001). Stereotype distinctiveness: How counter stereotypic behaviour shapes the self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 2, 193-205.

Walkerdine, V. (1998). *Counting girls out: Girls and mathematics*. London: Falmer Press.

Williams, S. L. (2002). Trying on gender, gender regimes, and the process of becoming women. *Gender and Society*, 16, 1, 29-52.

West, C. & Zimmerman, D.H. (1991). Doing gender. In J. Lorber & J. A. Farrell (Eds.), *The social construction of gender* (pp. 13- 37). Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Wolf, N. (1991). *The beauty myth: How images of beauty are used against women*. London: Vintage.

Whitehead, S. (2001). The invisible gendered subject: Men in education management. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 10, 1, 67-81.

University of Cape Town

APPENDIX 1
GENDER NORM VIOLATION CATEGORIES –McCARL-NIELSEN, WALDEN &
KUNKEL (2000)

Women's Unexplicitly Sexual Norm Violations

Buy/smoke cigar
Buy/smoke pipe
Buy/chew tobacco
Cars: change tires, fix, buy parts, check under hood, test drive, talk knowledgeably about
Enter/use men's bathroom
Fight physically in public
Open doors for men
In "male" occupations (e.g., pilot, lawyer, army combat, geologist, carpenter, bouncer, construction)
Do no do routine housework
Ask man out, pay for date
Be verbally loud and aggressive (watching sports, greeting)
Go shiftless in sports context
Buy/try on men's suits, ties
Spit in public
Wear moustache
Talk about menstruation
Work out in male weight room
Rent, buy, ask about construction products
Wear men's cologne
Buy jock strap
Walk alone, go out at night alone
Wear football uniform
Wear Rambo outfit, army fatigues
Send man flowers
Eat a lot in public
Play poker with "boys"
Do not shave legs, underarms
Wear men's wallets, money clip
Burp, belch, pass gas in public
Plays dumb about laundry
Gives seat to men
Seats men, holds coats
Beat man at pool
Play basketball with men
Challenge men at tennis, racquetball
Do martial arts
Ride skateboard
Adjust and spit before batting
Sit with legs apart
Wear and display tattoo
Appear bald
Wear skullcap to synagogue
Dress as priest
Appear androgynous
Urinate outside on road
Don't smile as receptionist
Go to all male country club
Go hunting with men
Go to fraternity rush
Be on all-male church committee

Women's "Sexual" Norm Violations

Ask men to dance, buy men drinks, try to pick up men, in bars
Violate heterosexual norm – date, dance with, be affectionate toward women, go to gay bars
Go to strip, topless bar
Catcall, wink, or whistle at, watch, rate men's bodies in public
Go to porn store
Buy condoms
Touch, pinch, pat men
Buy man engagement ring
Read Playgirl
Ask men to pose nude
Make obscene phone calls
Brag, talk about sex
Read, use pornography
Propose marriage
Put ad in paper for man
Scratch crotch
Tell dirty jokes

Men's Unexplicitly Sexual Norm Violations

Try on, wear, buy women's clothing and/or women's shoes in public
Wear make-up, lipstick, and/or have makeover
Shave body hair, color or curl hair, wear flower in hair
Wear, put on fingernails, fingernail polish, have manicure
Wear earrings
Do or help with housework, grocery shopping, be househusband
Apply for or do "women's" occupation – day care, baby sit, rape counselor
Do needlepoint, crochet, knit in public
Cry in public
Carry purse
Enter, use women's restroom
Show interest in bridal registry
Buy sanitary napkins
Ask woman to pay for dinner
Talk as though feminist
Wear pink shirts for a week
Have pedicure
Let woman beat him in track
Show an interest in fashion
Primp hair
Wear apron and hairnet
Use limp handshake
Throw Tupperware party
Dance woman's part of square dance
Play bridesmaid during wedding rehearsal
Read romance novels

Men's "Sexual" Norm Violations

Violate heterosexual norm – dance with, be affectionate with men, go to gay bars
Wear, try on women's underwear, halter top, nightgown, bathing suit
Perform in male beauty pageant

APPENDIX 2
ATYPICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

BEHAVIOURAL NORMS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Age _____
2. *Gender M ☐ F ☐
3. Relationship Status – Married ☐ Single ☐ Divorced ☐ In a Relationship ☐ Other _____
4. Home Language _____
5. *Race _____
6. Religion _____

*These questions are required for the research to ensure a representative sample.

In the following questions you are asked to give your opinion of whether the behaviour described is acceptable or not, or somewhere between. By “unacceptable” we mean such things as “improper”, “undesirable”, “objectionable”, while acceptable means such things as “suitable”, “okay”, “tolerable”. Please state your opinion by marking one of the squares labelled 1 – 6 with an ‘X’, where these numbers reflect the range from completely acceptable to completely unacceptable. Please mark only one number per question.

7. You see two women standing on Jamison Steps punching one another. Do you think their behaviour is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

8. Heather's boyfriend regularly buys Fairlady, Femina and Cosmopolitan. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

9. You're on a bus that is overcrowded. A man climbs on and looks for a seat. A woman gets up and offers her seat. Do you think this behaviour is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

10. A female student placed an advert with 'date-line.com' for a suitable male partner. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

11. At Vanessa's braai, her brother was lying at the pool in a woman's bikini bottom. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

12. One of the male lecturers was quietly knitting whilst overseeing exams. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

13. There is a couple in your tutorial, whenever they enter or leave the lecture hall the woman always steps aside and opens the door for her boyfriend. Do you think this behaviour

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

14. Thomas commented on how 'hot' Jonathan looked. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

15. Melissa asked Kevin out on a date and paid for the evening. Do you think this behaviour is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

16. A man in your class bought flowers for another man. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

17. You notice a woman sitting in the library with her legs wide open. Do you think this behaviour is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

18. Sarah's brother entered a male beauty pageant. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

19. There is a woman in your Psych tutorial that has hairy legs and armpits. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

20. At Billy's Bar, Jenny bought Mark a drink and then asked if he'd like to dance. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

21. At the Smuts Formal you see two men dancing together. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

22. Three women were sitting at a sidewalk café whistling and catcalling a number of men who walked past. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

23. Karen's father threw a Tupperware party and invited your mother. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

24. You work at the pharmacy on Saturday mornings and last week a woman came in and asked for condoms. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

25. One of the male lecturers regularly wears lipstick and mascara to class. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

26. A woman sitting on a barstool at a local pub pinched the barman's bum as he passed her. Do you think her behaviour is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

27. There was a man in a women's clothing shop trying on skirts. Do you think his behaviour is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

If you would be prepared to take part in a short interview or focus group at a time that is convenient for you, please write your name and contact number in the space provided. Please note that all interview material will be treated as strictly confidential.

Name _____ Tel No. _____

Thank you very much for your time

APPENDIX 3
CONTROL QUESTIONNAIRE

BEHAVIOURAL NORMS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Age _____
2. *Gender M ☐ F ☐
3. Relationship Status – Married ☐ Single ☐ Divorced ☐ In a Relationship ☐ Other _____
4. Home Language _____
5. *Race _____
6. Religion _____

*These questions are required for the research to ensure a representative sample.

In the following questions you are asked to give your opinion of whether the behaviour described is acceptable or not, or somewhere between. By “unacceptable” we mean such things as “improper”, “undesirable”, “objectionable”, while acceptable means such things as “suitable”, “okay”, “tolerable”. Please state your opinion by marking one of the squares labelled 1 – 6 with an ‘X’, where these numbers reflect the range from completely acceptable to completely unacceptable. Please mark only one number per question.

7. You see two men standing on Jamison Steps punching one another. Do you think their behaviour is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

8. Jim's girlfriend regularly buys Car Magazine and Men's Health. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

9. You're on a bus that is overcrowded. A woman climbs on and looks for a seat. A man gets up and offers his seat. Do you think this behaviour is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

10. A male student placed an advert with 'date-line.com' for a suitable female partner. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

11. At Vanessa's braai, her sister was lying at the pool in a man's Speedo. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

12. One of the female lecturers was quietly knitting whilst overseeing exams. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

13. There is a couple in your tutorial, whenever they enter or leave the lecture hall the man always steps aside and opens the door for his girlfriend. Do you think this behaviour

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

14. Claire commented on how 'hot' Laura looked. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

15. Kevin asked Melissa out on a date and paid for the evening. Do you think this behaviour is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

16. A woman in your class bought flowers for another woman. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

17. You notice a man sitting in the library with his legs wide open. Do you think this behaviour is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

18. Sarah's sister entered a female beauty pageant. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

19. There is a man in your Psych tutorial that has hairy legs and armpits. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

20. At Billy's Bar, Mark bought Jenny a drink and then asked if she'd like to dance. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

21. At the Smuts Formal you see two women dancing together. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

22. Three men were sitting at a sidewalk café whistling and catcalling a number of women who walked past. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

23. Karen's mother threw a Tupperware party and invited your mother. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

24. You work at the pharmacy on Saturday mornings and last week a man came in and asked for condoms. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

25. One of the female lecturers regularly wears lipstick and mascara to class. Do you think this is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

26. A man sitting on a barstool at a local pub pinched the barlady's bum as she passed him. Do you think her behaviour is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

27. There was a woman in a man's clothing shop trying on men's suits. Do you think his behaviour is

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Completely Acceptable | Acceptable | Slightly Acceptable | Slightly Unacceptable | Unacceptable | Completely Unacceptable |

If you would be prepared to take part in a short interview or focus group at a time that is convenient for you, please write your name and contact number in the space provided. Please note that all interview material will be treated as strictly confidential.

Name _____

Tel No. _____

Thank you very much for your time